Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

463

FRANKLIN EDGERTON

BUDDHIST HYBRID SANSKRIT

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Ten Public Lectures
by
FRANKLIN EDGERTON

Holkar Visiting Professor (1953–1954) of Indology
in Banaras Hindu University; Sterling Professor
of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology,
Emeritus, in Yale University.

राजकीय संग्रहालय, लखनऊ
क्र संख्या 463
प्राप्ति तिथि 11·1·61
विभाग
श्रेणी
STATE MUSEUM, LUCKNOW.

BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY
BANARAS.
1954.

CHOWKHAMBA SANSKRIT SERIES OFFICE
VARANASI.

Published by:–BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY, BANARAS.

Printed by:—P. N. Bhargava, Bhargava Bhushan Press, Banaras.

CONTENTS

Preface

LECTURE 1 : General Nature of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Language 1

LECTURE 2 : Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna; the Mahāvastu .. 8

LECTURE 3 : The Mahāvastu, continued 17

LECTURE 4 : Other Works Classed as Hīnayāna 26

LECTURE 5 : Primarily Mahāyāna Texts : the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka 36

LECTURE 6 : Other Mahāyāna Works; Development of Mahāyāna Buddhism 48

LECTURE 7 : The Position of BHS among Middle Indic Dialects 58

LECTURE 8 : BHS Metrics, Phonology, and Saṃdhi 66

LECTURE 9 : BHS Noun and Pronoun Inflection 71

LECTURE 10 : The BHS Verb 79

PREFACE

One of the conditions of the Holkar Visiting Professorship, which I now occupy, is that its incumbent shall deliver a series of ten public lectures, on a topic chosen by him with the approval of the Banaras Hindu University, which is to publish the lectures in book form. This book presents the ten lectures delivered in accordance with that provision, with slight rearrangement of some materials.

The parts dealing with the language are, of course, based on my Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar, Dictionary, and Reader, published by the Yale University Press in 1953. That work was as comprehensive as I could make it, and was designed for scholars. It is hoped that the present small book may be useful in making the salient features of the language more easily accessible, and more readily comprehensible, to a wider circle of readers; to many who have not the time or patience to go through my Grammar, and who yet may be curious to learn something of the nature of the language in which most North Indian Buddhist texts are composed. The last four chapters presuppose some knowledge of Sanskrit; they are designed to establish the fundamental Middle Indic character of the language, and to summarize its most important and interesting differences from Sanskrit. They are selective, not exhaustive. They are intended to present the most regular and characteristic grammatical forms of Middle Indic character, along with a few rarer forms which have been included because they are linguistically curious and interesting.

The chapters on the literature (Lectures 2 to 6) are also selective rather than exhaustive. I have mentioned, at least in passing, nearly every text exploited for my Grammar and Dictionary. I have chosen a few, which for one reason or another seem the most interesting and important, for more or less detailed discussion. I have tried to include, in passing, references to the major incidents of the Buddha's life history, and even some of his previous incarnations, as my texts present them. I have also tried to bring out, in passing, the most important doctrines of Mahāyāna Buddhism, contrasting it with Hīnayāna. But the reader will have to look elsewhere for a connected Life of the Buddha, or a unified statement about the two grand divisions of the Buddhist community. And a more systematic and scholarly account of the literature will be found in the second volume of Winternitz's History of Indian Literature; except that, of course, a few of my texts appeared in print too late to be included in that standard authority. My treatment of the literature is little more than a collection of personal impressions. I could not have hoped to rival Winternitz, even if space had permitted, and am very glad to be able to refer to his admirable work, which, with its exhaustive bibliographical references down to the date of its publication, makes that sort of treatment largely superfluous.

Franklin Edgerton,

BANARAS,
February, 1954,

BUDDHIST HYBRID SANSKRIT

LECTURE 1

General Nature of the BHS Language

I have invented the term Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit to apply to the language which served as the vehicle for most of the religious texts of North Indian Buddhism, so far as they are preserved to us. Aside from this language, we have North Indian Buddhist texts only in Standard Sanskrit, and in one (north-western) Middle Indic vernacular, in which we have only one fragmentary manuscript from Central Asia, called the manuscript Dutreuil de Rhins; this contains a collection of verses commonly called the Prakrit Dharmapada. The Pali language, to be sure, was also originally a North Indian vernacular; but it was brought to Ceylon in early times, and all known Pali texts are now preserved only among Southern Buddhists, in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, and Cambodia. In the next five lectures in this course I shall describe, in greater or less detail, the principal literary works which we have preserved in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. The language itself I have described for scholars in my Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar (Yale University Press, 1953), and I have been introducing students, and some of my colleagues in this university, to it in a university course which I am still conducting here. In the last four of this series of public lectures, I shall try to describe its most important features in a less technical way, which I hope will be easily comprehensible to anyone, or at least to all who have some knowledge of Sanskrit. In this introductory lecture I shall try to characterize it only in the most general terms, to indicate what I believe to be its relation to other Indic languages, and to suggest how it acquired its very peculiar character.

This language originally was, or was based on, an ancient, pre-Christian, Middle Indic vernacular. That is, it is not, and never was, Sanskrit. But from the very start of our records, its texts show—at least in the spelling of their manuscripts (we shall see later why I introduce this qualification)—a partial adaptation to Sanskrit. We may guess that this was due to the growing prestige of Sanskrit among the non-Buddhist Hindus, neighbors of the early Buddhists. The texts contain many words and forms which look like standard Sanskrit, and many others which seem to be partially Sanskritized, while they retain some Middle Indic features. Others still, in the very same sentences or verses, remain out-and-out Middle Indic, free from any Sanskritization.

This state of things is true not only of the grammatical form, and often of the phonetic form, of the words used, but also of the words themselves. The vocabulary is to a very large extent not Sanskrit, but Middle Indic. That is, many words do not exist in Sanskrit, or do not exist there with the same meanings, but do exist in Middle Indic dialects, the vocabulary of which is in considerable part different from Sanskrit. Even when the spelling of such words is Sanskritized, as it often is, so that they look like Sanskrit in phonetic and grammatical form, they show their Middle Indic origin by the fact that they are never used in standard Sanskrit, or not in the same meanings.

As time went on, the literary tradition of BHS tended to be more and more Sanskritized in appearance. Redactors, and even mere scribal copyists, often changed Middle Indic or hybrid forms to look more like Sanskrit. Sometimes they also eliminated non-Sanskrit words, replacing them with normal Sanskrit words; but this happened less frequently; in general the vocabulary remained basically Middle Indic, however Sanskritized the phonetic and grammatical forms became. The latest stage of this development presents texts which superficially look almost like Standard Sanskrit, and in fact are usually called Sanskrit, but in my opinion wrongly. If one looks close, he will always find a rather considerable number of non-Sanskrit forms, and a much larger number of non-Sanskrit words (usually made to look like Sanskrit in form).

This progressive Sanskritization in the tradition has, unfortunately, been continued still further by most modern editors of BHS texts. Only too often they seem to assume, tacitly or avowedly, that it is their duty to eliminate Middle Indic and hybrid forms, so far as they conveniently can; and they make it convenient with startling ease. If the manuscripts vary between a 'correct' Sanskrit form and a dialectic one, they almost automatically choose the 'correct' one; sometimes they are ready to do this even if it spoils the meter of a verse. Nay, they will often emend and make a form 'correct' Sanskrit against *all* their manuscripts, and even when the manuscripts of many other BHS texts present the 'incorrect' form very frequently.

This common editorial procedure implies that we are dealing with just bad or corrupt Sanskrit. But this is a fundamental mistake. Instead, this language is basically Middle Indic, gradually but never more than imperfectly altered so as to resemble Sanskrit. In general, every Middle Indic or hybrid form found in *any* manuscript should be carefully preserved, and put into a printed text by editors, as a precious relic which escaped the pedantic zeal of Sanskritizing redactors and copyists.

It is possible that, to begin with, the language was actually much less Sanskritized than it seems to be, in the written form found in the manuscripts. Most of the texts are composed in a mixture of prose and verse. In most texts, the prose is much more Sanskritized than the verses, which contain far more Middle Indic and hybrid forms. Further, in the verses of all the earlier texts, meter shows that consonant clusters written as in Sanskrit at the beginning of words were pronounced as single consonants, as they would have to be in normal Middle Indic, which as a rule tolerates only a single consonant at the beginning of a word. This was proved in my article 'Meter, Phonology and Orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit', JAOS 66.197 ff. Even the orthography, in prose as well as verses, frequently confirms this, with spellings like *khandhāvāra*, 'camp', for Skt. *skandhāvāra*. There are also, at least sporadically, spellings showing other items of Middle Indic phonology (e.g. *vuccati*, for Skt. *ucyate*). It seems, then, possible that the extensive Sanskritization found in the manuscripts was, in older periods at any rate, orthographic only, and that the real pronunciation was Middle Indic.

As I said at the outset, the name Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit is my invention. Most people either speak of it simply as 'Sanskrit', or at most 'Buddhistic Sanskrit', which seems to me unfortunate, because it implies that it is a kind of Sanskrit, whereas it can properly be called only a 'hybrid', primarily and originally not Sanskrit at all but Middle Indic, only secondarily and imperfectly Sanskritized. Professor Winternitz, in his History of Indian Literature, uses the term 'mixed Sanskrit', which is much better. But his application of the term is much too limited. He uses it only of the verses of most texts, admitting 'mixed Sanskrit' prose only in the Mahāvastu, where by exception the prose is just as Middle Indic or hybrid as the verses. In my opinion, the prose of all BHS texts belongs to the same linguistic tradition as the verses, and should be called by the same name.

In any case, it seems to me certain that the language, as it is written in our manuscripts and editions, cannot represent a genuine vernacular. It was a religious language only. It functioned for Buddhists as Sanskrit had come to function for non-Buddhist Hindus, except that the Buddhists seem never to have used it for secular literature.

In my BHS Grammar and Dictionary I have systematically ignored all words and forms which agree with standard Sanskrit, in both form and meaning. Some of them, no doubt, also existed in the original underlying Prakrit. But there is no objective, scientific way of distinguishing such inheritances from the many Sanskritisms which we know were introduced secondarily, by late redactors, copyists, or even modern editors. My task, as I conceived it, was to list and classify only the words and forms which are not Sanskrit, and which may therefore reasonably be attributed to the underlying Prakrit.

There have been attempts to identify that underlying Prakrit with Middle Indic dialects that are known elsewhere. And these attempts have been somewhat blended, or confused, with discussions of what the supposed 'original language of Buddhism' may have been. These questions can be best considered in the light of evidence as to the linguistic habits of the Buddha and his disciples, and their attitudes towards the use of various languages as vehicles for religious propaganda.

In the beginning, Buddhism made use of spoken vernaculars only. The Buddha himself commanded his followers to do so, according to a well-authenticated report, found in its Pali form in Cullavagga 5.33 (Vinaya ed., ii. 139.1 ff.), which may be rendered in abbreviated form as follows:

> Two monks, brothers, brahmans by birth, of fine (cultivated) language and fine (eloquent) speech, came to the Buddha and said: Lord, here monks of miscellaneous origin (lit. of various names, clan-names, races or castes, and families) are corrupting the Buddha's words by (repeating them in) their own dialects. Let us put them into Vedic (*chandaso āropema*). The Lord Buddha rebuked them: Deluded men, how can you say this? This will not lead to the conversion of the unconverted.. And he delivered a sermon and commanded (all) the monks: You are not to put the Buddha's words into Vedic. Who does so would commit a sin. I authorize you, monks, to learn the Buddha's words each in his own dialect.

The antiquity and reliability of this tradition is proved by the fact that several Chinese Vinaya texts also report it (see my Grammar, §§ 1.7-13.) They agree with the Pali in saying that monks who came from different regions and social classes recited the Buddha's words 'incorrectly', with 'mistakes' in sounds and grammar; one version says, 'their pronunciations are not the same'. The Buddha replies that he is not interested in elegant language, but cares only that the meaning be correct. He orders monks to preach so that all people can understand them, in the popular languages of the various regions; and he particularly forbids them to use 'the language of heretics', *i.e.* Vedic or Sanskrit, the property of non-Buddhists.

We see, then, first, that the Buddha authorized and commanded the recitation of his teachings in local dialects everywhere, and secondly, that from the very start there were clearly perceptible differences in the speech of different members of the Buddhist order, which showed in their ways of reciting the sacred texts. 'Their pronunciations are not the same', one version says; and all versions emphasize the differences of local and social origin which showed in the speech of the monks, and also the important fact that the Buddha himself sanctioned this state of things, and specifically authorized everyone to recite the sacred texts in his own dialect.

So why speak of any one 'original language of Buddhism'? Unless, indeed, we define it as the language spoken by the Buddha. And no one knows just what language he spoke.

The Buddha was an easterner, and it seems that most of his personal disciples and converts belonged to the general region of modern Bihar and the adjoining parts of Oudh or U.P. So it is not strange that some scholars have tried to find in ancient Buddhist texts, both Pali and BHS, traces of the languages of those regions, Māgadhī and Ardhamāgadhī Prakrit. I have discussed these attempts in the first chapter of my BHS grammar. This is not the place to go into matters of technical linguistics; a later lecture will return to the subject. Let me content myself with saying here that I find no clear evidence of such traces. Contrariwise, I have collected and listed a considerable number of linguistic items found in BHS which are not found in Māgadhī or Ardhamāgadhī, and many of which are not found either in Sanskrit or in any Middle Indic language of which we have any record elsewhere. From these facts I conclude that the Middle Indic underlying BHS was a quite independent dialect, at least not precisely identifiable with any that we know otherwise.We do not know where it was spoken; there is no evidence available. We know nothing about it except what the BHS texts reveal, and our knowledge of linguistic geography in pre-Christian India is too limited to make possible identification with any otherwise recorded dialect.

Let me summarize the results of this lecture. The Buddha commanded his disciples to use only popular dialects in reciting his teachings. They followed his instructions for a time. Many dialects all over North India were thus used by local schools of Buddhists. One such dialect, perhaps originally spoken at Ujjain, was Pali, which was carried to Ceylon, Burma, etc., and became the canonical language of Southern Buddhism. Another such dialect, of unknown original location, began after a time to be modified by the local Buddhists to make it look more like Sanskrit, the socially respected language of their brahman neighbors. This Sanskritization was at first slight and partial. As time went on it increased, but it never became complete. Prakritic forms continued to be used, and many forms were mixed or hybrid, neither genuine Prakrit nor standard Sanskrit. The vocabulary, especially, remained largely Prakritic. Thousands of words were used which are unknown in Sanskrit, or not used there with the same meanings. To this curious language, which became widespread in North India, I have given the name Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit. After more than twenty years of research I have published, in 1953, the only complete Grammar and Dictionary of the language ever attempted.

LECTURE 2

HĪNAYĀNA AND MAHĀYĀNA : THE MAHĀVASTU

In the next five lectures I shall try to give a sketch of the most important works of BHS literature. First however it is necessary to say something of the two schools of Buddhism to which these works belong, commonly called the Hīnayāna, 'lesser vehicle', and Mahāyāna, 'great vehicle'. These two terms are used only by adherents of the Mahāyāna, which claims to present the true doctrine of the Buddha, and regards its rival as an imperfect and unsatisfactory interpretation, hence called Hīna-yāna, 'lesser vehicle'. Southern Buddhism, presented in Pali literature, belongs as a whole to the Hīnayāna, tho it contains some adumbrations of ideas which in the north developed into what there came to be known as Mahāyāna. I believe, with most scholars, that in spite of Mahāyāna claims, this Hīnayāna school comes closer to the Buddha's original doctrine. The Buddha's cardinal doctrine is set forth in his Four Noble Truths: all sentient existence is suffering; suffering is caused by desire, longing for this or that finite object; it may be removed by suppression of such desires; and the way to such removal is the Noble Path or Course of Conduct, with its eight aspects, culminating in arhatship, which will lead to nirvāṇa, cessation of all normal sentient existence and so of suffering. The goal thus taught by the Buddha was individual nirvāṇa; any man who heeded his clearly proclaimed message could and should follow it and so attain salvation for himself. This is in essence the whole kernel of original Buddhism. In it the person of the Buddha was at first quite human. He was the great Physician, healer of men, prescribing the means of curing their misery; not, at first, a god.

But even within the sphere of Hīnayāna, there soon arose a tendency to treat the Buddha as a god, or at least as superhuman. The Lokottaravādins, a Hīnayāna school, taught that the Buddha's nature was in very truth supra-worldly. His participation in human life with its finite needs and limitations was only a semblance. In the Mahāyāna, this idea was developed much farther. The Buddha now came to be regarded as completely and permanently above humanity. Even his entrance into nirvāṇa was a mirage; in truth he was permanently released. In some Mahāyāna texts he comes to have the attributes of Brahman, the world-soul, of Hinduism. Oftener, to be sure, we hear in Mahāyāna of an infinite plurality of Buddhas, all indeed having the same nature, teaching identical doctrines, and functioning in the same ways on earth, or rather each in his own world-system or 'Buddha-field' (*buddha-kṣetra*), for there can be only one Buddha at one time in one 'field'; the 'Buddha-field' is an essentially Mahāyāna notion, tho anticipations of it are not unknown in Hīnayāna. All Buddhas are divine and must be worshipped devoutly by true Buddhists; Buddha-worship becomes a fundamental element of Mahāyāna.

Still more important, in distinguishingt he two grand divisions of Buddhism, is the development of a new human ideal, that of the Bodhisattva. This word is familiar in Hīnayāna, where it means one destined to become a Buddha, before he attains enlightenment. In Mahāyāna the notion develops that a Bodhisattva is an even more important, perhaps even a more admirable, figure than a Buddha, because without attaining Buddhahood, the Bodhisattva remains in worldly life in countless incarnations thru innumerable aeons, devoting himself to the welfare of mankind, and even refusing to save himself by entering nirvāṇa until all men shall be saved. Infinite pity and self-sacrifice characterize the Bodhisattva. To the Mahāyāna he is vastly superior to the *arhant* of the Hīnayāna, whose aim is simply to save himself, or the Pratyekabuddha, who has indeed attained enlightenment and will soon enter nirvāṇa but does nothing to save mankind. The Bodhisattvas are, to be sure, at least in theory, always dependent on the Buddhas, whom they worship with devotion and whose doctrines they preach. But the adherents of Mahāyāna Buddhism felt them as closer, warmer, more human figures, and prayed to them for help in times of need.

Both Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna schools are represented in BHS literature. Even more interesting is the fact that in a number of cases both appear in the same work. Or rather, what seems actually to have happened is that an older Hīnayāna work was taken up later by Mahāyānists, who recast some parts of it, or oftener added new sections in the spirit of the Mahāyāna. This is what seems to have happened to the Lalitavistara, which Chinese authorities class as Hīnayāna, and which indeed shows nothing characteristically Mahāyāna-like in most of its parts, but does show such characteristics at times, especially near the beginning. It is also true of the Mahāvastu, which for the most part reads like a normal Hīnayāna text, but has definite and extensive Mahāyāna additions. Some texts, like the Avadānaśataka and the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra, are unalloyed Hīnayāna. Others, like the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā, are completely Mahāyāna, and often show strong partisan animus against the Hīnayāna.

We shall begin with Hīnayāna texts, or at least with those which were originally Hīnayāna. These include most of the oldest BHS texts, tho some of them are mixed with Mahāyāna materials, at least as handed down to us. Later we shall come to purely Mahāyāna texts. In the course of our treatment we shall try to bring out most of the characteristic doctrines of Mahāyāna, which distinguish it from Hīnayāna.

The oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit text we have is undoubtedly the Mahāvastu. Winternitz believes that its 'kernel' goes back to the second century B.C. It calls itself part of the Vinayapiṭaka of the Lokottaravādin division of the Mahāsāṃghika sect; which means that it belongs to the Hīnayāna. It is a rather formless mass; in so far as it shows an approach to a unified plan, it can be regarded as a Life of the Buddha. As in the Pali Nidānakathā (Introduction to Jātaka), this is told in three parts (Pali *dūre-*, *avidūre-*, *santike-nidāna*); 1 begins with the Bodhisattva's life as Megha (Pali Sumedha) under Buddha Dīpaṃkara (i. 193 ff.), 2 (Vol. ii) with his rebirth in the Tuṣita heaven, where he decides to be reborn for the last time of Māyā, his miraculous conception and birth, departure from home, fight with Māra, and final enlightenment; and 3 (Vol. iii) tells the first conversions and rise of the monkish community, agreeing mainly with the Pali Mahāvagga account. This third part seems to be the justification of its being called a Vinaya text; as in Pali, the Vinaya included an account of the origin of the Buddhist monkish community. The Mv would otherwise not seem like a Vinaya work, as it contains hardly any rules for the life of monks, the standard content of the Vinaya. But this Life of Buddha is preceded and constantly interrupted by a large and miscellaneous number of other passages. Many of these have no visible relation to the 'main' story or to each other. It is characteristic of Mv that it commonly makes no attempt to relate its parts to each other; they are baldly and inartistically juxtaposed. As a work of art it must, as a whole, rank very low: 'a labyrinth, in which the thread of a connected narrative of the Buddha's life can only be discovered with some difficulty' (Winternitz 241). Yet it has a good many sections which are artistically very good. Many of its parts contain extremely old materials, often paralleled in Pali and in other (BHS) works, and in many cases the Mahāvastu versions seem quite as antique as other versions. It also contains, to be sure, many sections which are surely relatively late, and may have been secondarily inserted in their present location in the Mahāvastu. Not a few of these are clearly Mahāyāna, not Hīnayāna, in character. E.g., it has, near its beginning, a section on the Daśabhūmi, Ten 'Stages', a stylized development thru which the Bodhisattva must progress, according to the Mahāyāna. Also it contains long lists of Bodhisattvas, as well as Buddhas; these sections show the characteristic Mahāyāna belief in countless myriads of Buddhas, whereas in Pali as a rule only a few, at most 24, Buddhas are named, beginning with Dīpaṃkara. The Mv also interrupts itself with many other sections—Jātakas, Avadānas, dogmatic *sūtras, stutis* of Buddha, etc. Some of the Jātaka and other stories are not known otherwise, but many are paralleled especially in Pali. Often a section, whether an episode in Buddha's life, or a Jātaka, or other piece, is told two times, one after the other, with more or less divergence; sometimes the first version is prose and the other verse. Moreover sometimes the same incident is told, with more or less changes, several times in different parts; the story of the Buddha's birth is found actually four times.

The language of Mv differs from that of any other work that is entirely preserved to us in that its prose (not its verses alone) is wholly hybrid in character, there being no linguistic difference between its prose and verse. We have seen in the first lecture that most Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit works have Sanskritized their prose parts, in phonology and morphology, so extensively that they have often, tho I think erroneously, been called simply Sanskrit, while their verses typically remain Prakritic or hybrid. In the Mahāvastu alone (except for two short quotations in, or appendages to, later works) the prose is just as Middle Indic or hybrid as the verses. Stylistically, internal differences have been noted in the Mv prose, which correspond to differences between canonical and post-canonical Pali; but these two styles are as a rule hard to separate clearly, showing much mixture and confusion.

After an introduction which is itself confused and inartistic, containing very miscellaneous parts inexpertly juxtaposed, we come to a long section (i. 4.12 ff.) telling how the disciple Maudgalyāyana (Pali Moggallāna) visited the various hells; the text interpolates two other descriptions of the hells, one as 'seen' by the Buddha. Next Maudgalyāyana visits animal existences, pretas or ghosts, and asuras; after each visit he returns to report to the pious monks and laymen the fruits of evil karma which he saw. He then visits the abodes of the various classes of gods, who enjoy pleasures, but are subject to rebirth later in unhappy existences. The jātaka-like story of Abhiya, previous birth of Śākyamuni, is told to Maudgalyāyana in the Śuddhāvāsakāyika heaven. Next, Buddha instructs Maugalyāyana on various subjects; the latter again visits the Śuddhāvāsakāyika gods where he is further instructed. In i. 63.16 is the 'beginning of the 10 Bhūmis', a definitely Mahāyāna subject, but here introduced by an ancient sacred story. When the Buddha Śākyamuni entered nirvāṇa, there was a terrific earthquake. The disciple Kāśyapa, who was absent, perceived that this portent signalized the Master's passing. He set out straightway to embrace the Lord's feet, but on foot, considering it improper to make use of his magic power. The Mallas, among whom the Lord died, could not make his pyre burn; the clairvoyant disciple Aniruddha explains the reason; it was waiting for Kāśyapa. Kāśyapa arrives and exclaims on the instability of life, which must end even for a Buddha. The Lord's feet of themselves extend from the pyre to receive his worship; their usual radiance had been lessened by the tears shed on them by gods and men. The pyre then lights spontaneously. Kāśyapa dissuades 500 arhants from dying with the Lord by saying it is their duty to preserve his Law, reciting it together and in agreement. It is decided to convoke a Council at Rājagṛha, whither they all magically transport themselves. Maudgalyāyana instructs Kāśyapa to have the arhants examined as to any uncertainties which may exist about the religion. On Kāśyapa's request, Kātyāyana then states 'the course (*carita*, *caryā*) of Buddhas', beginning 'there are ten stages (*bhūmayo*) of Bodhisattvas'. The first three are only listed, not described.

'Having completed the tenth stage', the Bodhisattva, in the Tuṣita heaven, decides to be reborn on earth. He chooses Māyā as his mother; numerous gods decide to accompany him. They honor him in the womb where he, like all Buddhas, is conceived miraculously (*upapāduka*), not naturally by his parents. His mother is attended by apsarases; her qualities are described; gods honor her. She feels no pain when he descends into her womb. After ten months, a Bodhisattva appears from his mother's right side. There is then a verse account of Māyā's journey to the Lumbinī grove, where she gives birth standing and holding a branch of a tree. Only the highest (*śuddhāvāsa*) gods can cast the horoscope of a Bodhisattva; they appear disguised as brahmans and adore the child. Bodhisattvas are born knowing all human arts; after their Tuṣita existence they renounce all sensual pleasure. Rāhula was not really the son of Śākyamuni, but miraculously descended into the womb, tho his birth is not *aupapāduka* like that of cakravartins (and Śākyamuni). Various unrelated passages follow, including a statement that Buddhas are really supramundane (*lokottara*), and only to conform to worldly custom seem to share human needs and weaknesses.

In i. 177.13 begins a passage on the Buddha's *upahāras*, on which see my Dictionary s.v.; they are 'beneficial services' to others, acts by which he miraculously intervenes to prevent some one from committing a grievous sin or to convert him from a dangerous heresy. A number of detailed stories are told in which he thus saved named individuals. Only after these we find a formal conclusion, with two colophons, of (first) the tenth Bhūmi, in the 'Mahāvastu avadāna', and (then) 'the ten Bhūmis, a section (? *parisaram*) of the Mahāvastu' (i. 193.12).

Here at last begins the main story of Śākyamuni and his previous incarnations, beginning with his first vow to attain enlightenment, which was made under the Buddha Dīpaṃkara, whose descent from the Tuṣita heaven, conception, and birth are told, all in terms parallel to the familiar story of Śākyamuni. The mainly prose narrative is frequently interrupted by verses, the content of which is various. Some of them *e.g.* are laudations of the Bodhisattva (Dīpaṃkara) by the gods; some repeat in verses incidents of the story which have just been told in prose. There follow the casting of the prince's horoscope, and the giving of the name, Dīpaṃkara. But after this there is a drastic abbreviation of the schematic Buddha-story. Dīpaṃkara grows to manhood and is provided by his father with luxurious palaces and a large harem. Once he sees the women asleep, and finds the sight disgusting, as did Śākyamuni. At this moment a gigantic lotus appears in a near-by pool; the Bodhisattva takes a seat cross-legged on this lotus, which surrounds and covers him like a pavilion. Now his clothing is miraculously changed to an ascetic's garb; he enters successively into the four dhyānas, states of trance; he remembers all his countless former births; and at the end of the very same night attains perfect enlightenment (i. 229.11). He returns and enters with great pomp into his native city with 60,000 monks (large numbers, and numerous miracles, in this part of the story suggest Mahāyāna additions). A young brahman student named Megha arrives about this time, presents flowers to the Buddha, and makes an 'earnest wish' or vow to attain enlightenment. The Buddha prophesies that after countless ages he will be the Buddha Śākyamuni. (This prophecy is repeated twice, briefly, in partly corrupt and fragmentary verses.) Under the next following Buddha, Maṅgala, the same person was a nāga-king named Atula, who repeated his vow and received from Maṅgala the same prediction. (Repetition in verse.)

Now the former births of Śākyamuni are abruptly interrupted by several long unrelated stories. First, the *chattravastu*, 'matter of the parasols', pp. i. 253-300, told of the historic Śākyamuni, who on the Licchavis' entreaty went to Vaiśālī to save the city from a pestilence. Emboxed in it are several jātakas telling how the Buddha in past births had similarly averted disaster from human beings. Then comes the story of Mālinī (300-317), the main part of which takes place under the Buddha Kāśyapa, the next one before Śākyamuni.

Next come two versions of a story which may with more justice be regarded as part of the past experience of Śākyamuni. The Jyotipālasūtra (317-335) is put into the mouth of Śākyamuni himself; it concerns his previous birth as the brahman Jyotipāla, who after long resistance was brought by his friend, the potter Ghaṭikāra, to the Buddha Kāśyapa, was converted, and finally, when he conceived the wish for enlightenment, received Kāśyapa's prophecy that he would become the Buddha Śākyamuni. This is immediately followed by a briefer, but also prose, account (335-338), called *Jyotipālasya vyākaraṇa,* 'Jyotipāla's prediction of Buddhahood'.

Next comes a section called *Rājavaṃśa,* the genealogy of Śākyamuni. It begins with a curious myth of a kind of golden age of mankind, finally lost in an outbreak of violence which resulted in the decision to establish kingship, in order to enforce justice, and the election of the first king, Mahāsaṃmata. The descent of the Śākyas is traced from him; next, the origin and marriage of Śuddhodana and Māyā. Gods, twelve years in advance, announce the approaching birth of the Buddha. Hearing this, five hundred Pratyekabuddhas living near Banaras entered nirvāṇa; their bodies were consumed by the fire native to them, and fell at the place thenceforth called Ṛṣi-patana (modern Sarnath, near Banaras). Here follows the story of the Deer-king and the Doe, explaining the term 'deer-park', Mṛgadāva, as 'gift (*dāya*) of security to the deer', which I shall translate in the next lecture, as evidence that the Mahāvastu contains some really good literature.

LECTURE 3

THE MAHĀVASTU (CONTINUED)

The story of the Deer-king and the Doe occurs in the Pali Jātaka book, the hero being there the Buddha in a previous birth; there it is not located at Ṛṣipatana. In the Mahāvastu it is not a jātaka, but simply a story told to explain the name Mṛgadāva, applied to Ṛṣipatana, the locality now called Sarnath. The tale is much better told in the Mahāvastu than in Pali and I shall give you a slightly abbreviated but quite faithful translation of it, as a sample of one of the best of Mv stories.

In this (Ṛṣipatana) wood a deer-king named Rohaka presided over a herd of a thousand deer. He had two sons named Nyagrodha and Viśākha. Now this deer-king gave each of his two sons five hundred deer. Brahmadatta, the king of Banaras, was always going a-hunting in this near-by grove, and killing the deer there. The deer whose flesh he ate himself were not so numerous as those who were wounded and entered into forest thickets and clumps of reeds, where they died and were eaten by crows and other birds of prey. The deer-king Nyagrodha said to his brother Viśākha: Viśākha, let us entreat the king of Banaras, saying, The deer whose flesh you eat are not so numerous as those who are wounded and enter into thickets, where they die and are eaten by crows and other birds of prey. We will give the king one deer, every day, who will come to your kitchen himself, and so this deer-herd will not suffer such disaster. Viśākha agreed. The king now came out to hunt, and the two deer-kings saw him coming from afar, with all his host, attended by men armed with various weapons. Then they went towards the king, fearlessly risking their lives. When the king saw the two deer-kings coming towards him from afar, he ordered his retinue: Let no one harm these deer that are coming; who knows what it means that they do not flee on seeing our host, but are approaching me? The host parted to the left and right and gave access to the two deer, who approached the king and knelt before him. The king asked them: What is your request? With human speech they now entreated the king: Great king, we were born and raised in this grove in your kingdom, with many hundreds of other deer. We are two brothers, lords of herds of deer, dwelling here in your majesty's realm. As your majesty's cities, towns, villages, and countrysides are adorned with men and cattle, thousands of human beings and animals, so these groves, hermitages, rivers and streams are adorned with such wild things, deer and birds. Thus is your majesty's location adorned. All such human beings and animals as dwell in your majesty's realm, whether in villages or in forests or on mountains, are under your protection; your majesty should care for and guard them all; you are their ruler, and no other king. When your majesty goes forth to hunt, many hundreds of deer are injured. Those whose flesh you eat are not so numerous as those who are wounded by arrows and flee into forest and river thickets and clumps of reeds, where they die and are eaten by crows and other birds of prey; and your majesty is guilty of wrongdoing. If your majesty graciously agrees, we two deer-kings will send you one deer every day who will come of himself to your kitchen, one from each of the two herds in turn; so your majesty will have deer-flesh to eat, and these deer will not be so afflicted. The king replied to them: Be it as you say; go and live without fear or danger, and send me one deer each day. And the king, having granted their entreaty, said to his ministers: No one is to injure the deer. So ordering he entered the city. And the deer-kings summoned all the deer and gave them cheering news: Fear not, we have asked the king not to go hunting any more; they will not injure the deer anywhere, and we shall send the king one deer each day, from each herd in turn.

And they counted all the deer in both herds, and drew lots, and one deer went to the king's kitchen daily from each herd in turn.

Once when it was the turn for one from Viśākha's herd, the lot fell on a certain pregnant doe to go to the king's kitchen. So the superintending deer told that doe: It is your turn today; go to the king's kitchen. She said: I am pregnant, there are two fawns in my womb; tell another to go; when I have brought forth, I will go, whereas now three of us would be going for one; after these two fawns are born, it will delay the fatal lot for you. The superintending deer reported this matter to the deer-king, who said: Order the deer who is next after this doe to go; after the two fawns are brought forth, she shall go. The superintendent passed over the doe and ordered the deer that was next after her to go to the king's kitchen. But he said: It is not my turn today, it is that doe's turn; that will give me a while to live. Thus various others were spoken to, but would not go out of turn; they all said, It is that doe's turn; let her go. The doe was told: No one wants to go out of turn; it is your turn, so go to the king's kitchen.

When the doe was not let off, for love of her (unborn) young she thought: They too will perish with my death; and she went to the other deer-herd and bowed down before its king. He asked her: What have you to say? What is your business? (She told what had happened, concluding:) I entreat you to send another deer from this herd; when I have brought forth, I will go. That deer-king said to her: Well, fear not, I will send another. He told his superintendent deer: Give orders to the deer whose turn is next from this herd; I have granted security to this doe. The superintendent ordered the deer whose turn was next: Go to the king's kitchen. But he said: It is not our herd's turn today; it is the turn of Viśākha's herd. The superintendent deer said: Today the lot fell on a doe from Viśākha's herd who is pregnant, and has two fawns in her womb. They would not let her off; they said: It is your turn, go! And when she couldn't get off, that doe came to this herd and entreated the herd-lord Nyagrodha. He granted that doe security and ordered me to send the deer whose turn it is from this herd. It is your turn from this herd, so go. He replied: Since it is the turn of the other herd today, I won't go out of turn. In this way whoever was commanded refused to go out of turn. The superintendent deer reported to the deer-king Nyagrodha: No one wants to go out of turn; they say, it is not our turn today, but the turn of the other herd-lord. The deer-king said: Let the doe go; I have granted her safety, and after this I cannot have her sent to the kitchen; I will go myself.

That deer-king took the road out of the forest thicket and went to Banaras. Whoever saw him going followed after him, thinking: This deer is beautiful, his appearance is very handsome, with red hoofs and eyes (as if colored) with pigment, bright and lovely. Attended by a great throng of people he went on till he came within the city, where the townsfolk saw him and many people recognized him as that deer-king. Seeing him they were distressed (and said:) All that great herd must have perished, and so he has come. We will go and beg the king that this deer-king be released and not slain, for he is an ornament to this place, a feast for the eyes; those who go forth in the forest and on the banks, their eyes are charmed at sight of this deer. And the chief queen along with that throng of people followed the deer-king and came to the palace. The deer-king entered the kitchen. And the king, as he sat in his judgment-hall, was entreated by the townsmen: O king, all that great herd of deer has perished; they were harmless beings, ate grass dry or wet, and offended no one, yet they are all destroyed, and here the lord of the herd himself has come. It is hard, O king, to find such a deer-king, gracious and charming, a delight to the people's eyes. When people go forth from the city to grove or bank or park or pool, they see this deer-king and are delighted with him, the ornament of the grove about the city. If your majesty pleases, let this deer-king be released alive.

The king ordered his ministers: Go, fetch that deer-king from the kitchen. The ministers went and brought him from the kitchen before the king. The king asked him: Why have you come yourself? Is there no other deer left, that you have come yourself? He replied: No, O king, there is no lack of other deer. But today it was the turn of the other herd; and the doe on whom the lot fell in that herd is pregnant and has two fawns in her womb. They told her: It is your turn today, go to the kitchen. Viśākha is the lord of the other herd. (She said to him:) It is my turn today to go to the king's kitchen. But I am pregnant, with two fawns in my womb. I beseech you to send another; when I have brought forth I will go. Then whatever other deer was ordered did not want to go; they said: It is that doe's turn, let her go; thus she was not let off. Not being let off by them, she came to me, and entreated me, saying: It is my turn today from that herd. I have two fawns in my womb; and they will not let me off. So I entreat the deer-king to order another from this herd to go to the king's kitchen; when later I have brought forth I will go. I granted security to that doe; but whatever deer I ordered would not come here out of turn. I realized that having given this doe security I must go myself; that is why I have come myself.

When the king heard the deer's words he was amazed, and all the throng of people with him: How virtuous this deer-king is! they said. The king of Banaras thought: This is not a beast, this deer who knows righteousness and offers himself for the sake of another. It is we who are beasts, who do not know righteousness and injure such harmless jewels of creatures as these. And he said to the deer-king: I am captivated by you, for you are full of compassion and an exalted soul; deer that you are, you have given security to this doe, your own dependent. I too, because of you and as a result of what you say, will give security to all the deer. From today on I grant security to all the deer in this place; go and dwell in freedom from fear and danger. The king had a proclamation made in the city: No one is to injure any deer in my kingdom......

Volume 2 of the Mahāvastu begins the second section (Pali *avidūre nidāna*) of Buddha's life, with Śākyamuni in the Tuṣita heaven, and his choice of the time, region (*deśa*), continent (*dvīpa*), and family in which he is to be reborn for the last time. His conception, birth, and infancy, are told more fully than above. The sage Asita visits him and predicts his Buddhahood, weeping because he will not live to see the Enlightened One; this incident is repeated in verse. Next we find the prince grown; his father assembles all the young Śākya girls that the prince may give them jewels; Yaśodharā is chosen as his wife. Numerous jātakas tell of earlier births, in which he and she were associated. Śuddhodana surrounds the prince with all pleasures and luxuries, but he perceives the superiority of ascetic life and leaves the palace. He first attends the teachers Ārāḍa Kālāma and Udraka Rāmaputra, but dissatisfied with them retires to solitude, and torments his body by extreme fasting, until he sees that this is fruitless, takes nourishment, and finally attains enlightenment.

This is clearly a much abbreviated version of his departure from the world and winning of enlightenment. A fuller version is now baldly inserted, without logical connection with the preceding. It resumes the story at the point where the Bodhisattva, already determined to renounce the world, argues with his father against worldly life. Then come the Four Sights which he saw, old man, sick man, corpse and monk. Next the scene where he is disgusted with the sight of the harem-women asleep; he summons his servant Chandaka and departs by night on the horse Kaṇṭhaka; soon after he dismisses servant and horse, and cuts off his hair, which the gods carry away and worship. He sends no message to Yaśodharā; there follow jātakas from their previous lives together. After this the story follows the earlier account in essence, but with insertion of other incidents, some paralleled in Pali and elsewhere; notably his struggle against Māra, the Evil One. Many jātakas are also inserted.

Before he attains enlightenment in this version, the life-story is interrupted by two different versions of what is called the Avalokitasūtra. They are represented as told by him, as Buddha, to groups of monks. They both include, however, the final attainment of enlightenment, with some of the events leading up to it, especially the attacks of Māra. A large number of unrelated matters, especially many didactic verses, help to swell the bulk of these two passages to over a hundred pages. The Śikṣāsamuccaya contains extracts from the Avalokanāsūtra, as it is there called, but only verses, many paralleled in the Mahāvastu. It is certain that neither the Mahāvastu nor the Śikṣāsamuccaya version is borrowed from the other; both drew from an older source, otherwise unknown.

After these interruptions the story resumes the Bodhisattva's approach to the Bodhi-tree. He is visited by the serpent Kāla, gets from the grass-cutter Svastika grass for his seat at the tree, and is assailed there by Māra; two or three versions occur of some of these incidents. Finally he attains enlightenment; gods pay him homage, and he himself proclaims his triumph. His cough was enough to disperse the hosts of Māra; similarly in a previous birth, when he was the unhappily ugly King Kuśa, the first version of whose story ends Volume 2. Volume 3 opens with a second version of this same story, this time told largely tho not wholly in verses. Other passages follow, referring to the Buddha's expressions on attaining enlightenment, with jātakas.

Then follow some incidents which interrupt the thread of the life-story, tho they perhaps come nearer to justifying the Mahāvastu's claim to be a Vinaya work, as they deal with the conversion of some of the Buddha's main disciples. First, Mahā-Kāśyapa's conversion is told, by himself, to Ānanda. Then, without statement of narrator or occasion, the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana. (Inserted is a jātaka of the horse Keśin; it is repeated in verse.) Śuddhodana invites the Buddha, and finally comes himself with all the Śākyas to pay him homage, and accompanies him to Kapilavastu. Yaśodharā tries to induce him to return to worldly life, but in vain. Jātakas are suggested by Yaśodharā's behavior, including the celebrated one of Ekaśṛṅga ('Unicorn') and Nalinī. Other Śākyas are received into the order, including Anuruddha (= Aniruddha) and the barber Upāli, and later Rāhula, the Buddha's son.

All these conversions and ordinations took place, of course, long after the enlightenment, to which the text at last reverts on p. 272 of Vol. 3. For two weeks Buddha remains motionless at the Bodhi-tree tasting the bliss of enlightenment. In the third week he makes the 'long promenade' (*dīrgha caṅkrama*), which according to the Lalita Vistara embraced the entire universe. At this time the daughters of Māra try to seduce him, but in vain. He passes four more weeks without breaking his fast, and first takes nourishment from the merchants Trapuṣa and Bhallika, in stone bowls held by the four *lokapālas*; he magically makes a single bowl out of the four. He first thinks of not proclaiming his gospel, lest men should fail to understand it; Brahmā, Śakra, and other gods persuade him to 'turn the wheel of the law'. He goes to Banaras, being entertained on the way by various men and supernatural beings, and preaches the first sermon to the five Bhadravargīya monks. These had been his disciples when he practised austerities, but left him when he gave up asceticism, thinking that he had turned worldly. Now when they see him coming, they agree not to rise and greet him, but find it impossible to refrain from doing so. He expounds to them the Four

Noble Truths, thus turning the 'wheel of the law with its three turns and twelve parts'. The first 'turn' is the way of seeing (*darśanamārga*) what the four Truths are; the second the way of putting them into effect (*bhāvanāmārga*); the third the stage in which the efforts of the second have succeeded (*aśaikṣamārga*); as each 'turn' applies to all four truths, there are twelve 'forms' or parts of it (*dvādaśākāra*). He further instructs the five monks on the five *skandhas* (form, *rūpa*; sensation, *vedanā*; concept, *saṃjñā*; predisposition, *saṃskāra*; consciousness, *vijñāna*), all of which 'have no personality' (*anātma*), are impermanent, and are the source of misery; 'they are not mine, they are not I, they are not the self (*ātman*);' but they are that which transmigrates, and so they take the place of the *ātman*, which does not exist for Buddha.

Miracles attend these instructions. Marvelous qualities are attributed to the Buddha's preaching voice. There are conversions of gods by the sermon; and laudations of Buddha. Jātakas show past births of Ājñātakauṇḍinya and the other bhadravargīya monks. Other conversions are told, of Pūrṇa Maitrāyaṇīputra; of Nālaka, nephew of Asita; of Sabhika, and Yaśoda. Buddha instructs the monks on their conduct (*vinaya*); in begging food they must present themselves in silence and make no request, nor express thanks for what they receive. After the rains they must disperse and live solitary lives. (These are just about the only genuine Vinaya passages, in the narrow sense, that is, rules for the behavior of monks, that occur in the entire Mahāvastu.) The three Kāśyapas are converted. Buddha is received at Rājagṛha by King Bimbisāra; a jātaka shows their relation in a former birth.

Final colophon: 'End of the Mahāvastu avadāna in the text of the Āryamahāsāṃghikas, division of the Lokottaravādins.'

LECTURE 4

OTHER WORKS CLASSED AS HĪNAYĀNA

The Lalitavistara is regarded as one of the most sacred Mahāyāna texts. It calls itself a *vaipulya sūtra,* 'discourse of great extent', a regular term for Mahāyāna sūtras, and 'exhibits all the peculiarities of a Mahāyāna sūtra' (Winternitz 248). Yet according to Chinese tradition it originally contained the life-story of the Buddha (hardly more than the *avidūre-nidāna*; from the Tuṣita heaven to the First Sermon) according to the Sarvāstivādin school of the Hīnayāna. Its title, 'detailed account of the (Buddha's) sport', Winternitz says 'corresponds to Mahāyāna ideas'; it is however perhaps equally appropriate to the Lokottaravādins who are still adherents of the Hīnayāna; note that, while this school is not definitely named in LV, its text gives the Buddha the epithets *lokottara* (92.4 and 425.4), and *lokottaradharmadeśika,* 424.21; all these in passages which seem Mahāyānistic in character. There are other features of LV which suggest that it is on the borderline between Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna. It retains from older sources many old materials which show no trace of Mahāyāna, while in others it shows clear Mahāyāna traits. It tells, as we have observed, the story of the Buddha's (or Bodhisattva's) life from his existence in the Tuṣita heaven, whence he was reborn in the womb of Māyā for his last rebirth, to his enlightenment, and beyond that to the first sermon. In large part, this narrative agrees closely with the Pali accounts, especially the oldest ones like those in the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya. It is clear that both these accounts, and the corresponding parts of the Mahāvastu as well, go back to the same very old tradition; none of the three can have used either of the others as a direct source. On the whole the Pali version seems most archaic, and Mv more archaic than LV. Yet there are features in Mv and even in LV, not only in verses but even in prose passages, which seem likely to be closer to the original than the Pali correspondents (once LV has an unaugmented aorist, *pratijñāsiṣaṃ,* where Pali has an augmented aorist, *paccaññāsiṃ.*) There are, however, incidents in the LV's story of the Bodhisattva's life which are not found at all in the Pali; some are found nowhere else and seem likely to be inventions of the author. In other cases, notably in the story of his conception in Māyā's womb and his birth, the LV story is full of extravagant and miraculous features, foreign to the Pali version, which is far simpler and more nearly human, tho not wholly free from miraculous features. For instance, in LV all the gods bring their palaces to Kapilavastu; the Bodhisattva by the power of a *samādhi* causes his pregnant mother to appear in every one of them, so that each god was convinced that she rested only in his particular palace. Further, there is a certain magical jewelled palace which is the inevitable 'article of enjoyment' (*paribhoga,* Dict.) of a Bodhisattva in his last existence; it appears then in his mother's womb on the right side, while at other times it stays in Brahmā's heaven. It has three turrets or apartments (*kūṭāgāra*), one within the other, and within the third a couch or litter (*paryaṅka*); it was hard as *vajra* yet soft to the touch; all the glories of the palaces of all the *kāmāvacara* gods appeared in this extraordinary habitation for the Bodhisattva in his mother's womb, the function of which is to keep him untouched by all human impurities. This is only one, perhaps the most bizarre, of the marvels attending the gestation and birth of the Bodhisattva. It is probably no accident that after the birth, the LV text inserts a dialog between Buddha and Ānanda which denounces those ignorant, unbelieving monks who, the Buddha says, in later times will refuse to believe in these marvels. The author of the LV evidently knew plenty of monks who adhered to the older, simpler and more nearly human Hīnayāna story as told in Pali, and seems self-conscious about his own account, which may be partly his own invention; I know of no parallel elsewhere to the magical jewelled *paribhoga* which housed the unborn Bodhisattva.

Quite Mahāyānistic, also, is the first, introductory chapter of LV. It opens, to be sure, like any Pali *sutta*: 'Thus I have heard, once the Blessed One dwelt in Śrāvastī in Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍada's grove, with a great community of 12,000 monks'; this number however is far more than in the usual Pali formula, where at most 500 monks are present. But here he is also attended by 32,000 Bodhisattvas, all perfected in all Bodhisattva qualities and bound to only one more rebirth (but still not, as in the fully developed Mahāyāna, refusing to enter nirvāṇa till all mankind is saved). After an expanded and glorified form of the usual formula describing the Buddha's glories and perfections, we are told that, when he had entered into *samādhi* in the middle of the night, there broke forth from his head a magnificent supernatural ray, accompanied by verses of laudation which stimulated the highest class of gods (Śuddhāvāsakāyika) to come to Buddha and implore him to reveal, for the salvation of mankind, the exalted Lalita-Vistara, the qualities of which are extravagantly described; it was previously revealed by Buddhas of old, of which 55 are named. (The first two are Padmottara and Dīpaṃkara, both included in the standard Pali list of 24 Buddhas, others of which also occur in this list; in particular the last six are the six that come just before Śākyamuni in Pali.) The Buddha indicates consent by silence. The chapter ends with a brief summary of its contents in eight verses. The real story begins with Chapter 2, which starts with the Bodhisattva in the Tuṣita heaven, and the greater part of it is not very different from the corresponding stories in Pali, and in the Mahāvastu as told above.

Among other late insertions in the Buddha-story, probably original with the LV's author, is the lively and at times amusing scene in which the young Bodhisattva first goes to school, along with ten thousand other boys, and with the school-lunch carried 'in ten thousand wagons filled with all kinds of food, and with gold and silver' perhaps to pay the school fees. At sight of his glory the master falls prostrate on the ground before him; a god appears to raise him up. The wonder-child asks him: 'In which script, master, will you teach me to write?' and proceeds to list 64 different alphabets, some of which the teacher confesses he has never heard of himself. They include Chinese and Hun (Cīna, Hūna) writing. (In Mv i. 135.5 a much shorter list of alphabets is given, in a passage which declares that Bodhisattvas have innate knowledge of all arts and sciences. Conceivably the author of LV may have been inspired by such a passage; but in Mv there is nothing said about going to school.) The teacher then proceeds to teach the alphabet to the ten thousand boys. As he pronounces each letter, by the supernatural power of the Bodhisattva a phrase beginning with that letter, and inculcating a religious lesson, is miraculously pronounced.

Unlike the Mv, the LV is an artistically pleasing and effective work of literature. The story is told mainly in prose, but there are numerous and sometimes very long passages of verse. The account of the Bodhisattva's struggle with Māra, before the enlightenment, is particularly long and spirited, with many fine poetic passages. The meters are extremely varied, and show great mastery of poetic art; many are very beautiful, worthy of comparison with mature works of Sanskrit kāvya. The majority of the meters are like Sanskrit meters, but some are not known in Sanskrit. Indeed, they are occasionally constructed like the Apabhraṃśa meters known as *mātrāchandas,* the metrical principles of which are unknown in Sanskrit and even in normal Prakrit. Evidently their author was a well-trained kāvya poet who was widely experienced in the metrical art of Middle Indic poetry. It must be noted that the verses of LV and most other BHS works, at least the older ones, even when composed in meters known in Sanskrit, show certain radical differences from the principles of Sanskrit prosody, and are clearly Middle Indic in character. They can, in fact, be read metrically only on the assumption that, at least in certain respects, they were pronounced as Middle Indic; in so far as the writing looks Sanskritic, this is window-dressing. Thus, for example, as was noted briefly in my first lecture, a consonant cluster at the beginning of a word must always be pronounced as a single consonant, as it would be in normal Middle Indic. This is true of all verses in older BHS texts, as I have shown in my article 'Meter, Phonology, and Orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit', JAOS 66.197 ff.

The Lalitavistara came to be a very popular work, and was one of the main sources of Buddhist iconography. It seems probable that its version of the Buddha story inspired the sculptors of the Borobudur stūpa in Java (ca. 850-900 A.D.). And it has been held that there may have been a relation between it and the much earlier Gandhāra Buddhist sculpture, which to be sure was probably based directly on oral rather than literary tradition; but that oral tradition could have had partly literary origins. Foucher, in his great book on the Buddhist art of Gandhāra, suggests that there may have been mutual influence between this art and such a literary text as the LV.

The word *avadāna,* to which in Pali corresponds the variant *apadāna,* is of unknown or at least disputed etymology. It is supposed to mean primarily 'noteworthy deed', usually a good deed, but sometimes a bad one. The stories called by this name are all supposed originally to have been designed to show the inescapable power of karma. One has the impression that, whatever its first meaning, the word came at times to mean practically no more than 'story'; the Mahāvastu itself is called an *avadāna* in its colophons. The oldest collection according to general belief, unless we count the Mahāvastu, is the Avadānaśataka, the 100 avadānas, which are divided into ten decads of ten stories each. It was translated into Chinese in the 3rd Century A.D. In this work, every story ends with a moral stated in a cliché, wthacute accent that a 'white' (*śukla,* i.e. good) deed always produces good results, a 'black' (*kṛṣṇa,* bad) one bad results. In many there is a Story of the Past, narrating the action in a previous birth which caused the result told in the Story of the Present. In some the hero in both is the Bodhisattva; these may also be called Jātakas; a Jātaka is an *avadāna* in which the Bodhisattva is the hero. Thus all Jātakas are *avadānas,* but not all *avadānas* are Jātakas. But also some *avadānas* have no Story of the Past; some action in the Story of the Present will, we are told, have a certain result in the future; these are *vyākaraṇa,* 'prophecies'. This kind of *avadāna* has no counterpart among the jātakas.

The Avadānaśataka is clearly a Hīnayāna work. Not only is it so classed by Chinese translators, but its general character confirms this; *e.g.*, it has no glorification of the Bodhisattva ideal, no boundless plurality of Buddhas, and in general its numbers are very moderate. A striking feature is the abundant use of clichés, passages which are used over and over again whenever the appropriate situation arises. Feer lists a great many of them in the introduction to his translation, and then in the translation itself saves space by merely referring to them by title. Thus the smile of the Buddha, which he manifests in predicting a future fate (commonly enlightenment) for someone, is an extremely long cliché, covering several printed pages. It tells how rays of various colors burst from his mouth, many of which travel to various hells or heavens, and after going around the universe, return and disappear in some part of the Buddha's body, which varies with the prophecy (if he should prophesy hell, into the soles of his feet; if perfect enlightenment, into the top of his head). Shorter clichés describe *e.g.* a prosperous country and its king, the state of a rich merchant, etc.

The Av was a very popular work. In later times various abstracts or imitations of it were composed, some of them in verses, and many introducing clear Mahāyāna features.

Of a different character is the Divyāvadāna. Tho it is relatively late, and the text now contains some Mahāyānistic passages, it is generally believed that these are secondary additions, and that fundamentally it belongs to the Hīnayāna. It is, in fact, held that it drew many of its materials from the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, which belongs to the Hīnayāna; this fact, long believed, seems definitely established by the discovery and publication of parts of that text (Gilgit Mss. Vol. 3). The fact is that *avadānas,* or in Pali *apadānas,* are well known in all Buddhist canons, in Pali perhaps mainly in the Vinaya but also in the Sutta Piṭaka. The Divy is late as a compilation but contains much old material, as well as much of later date. It often quotes by name from various canonical texts. It is in fact a confused and disorderly mass of stories of quite different origins, and in quite different styles; mostly to be sure in simple, straightforward prose occasionally varied by śloka verses, but at times embodying pieces in elaborate kāvya style, with verses in ornate meters.

Reference has just been made to the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins recently discovered (in large part) and published in Nalinaksha Dutt's Gilgit Mss. Vol. 3. Extensive sections, containing *avadānas,* seem to have been copied from it verbatim, or nearly so, into Divy. Even a few characteristic vinaya passages, that is rules for the behavior of Buddhist monks, were also thus copied, justifying the claim that Divy is fundamentally a Vinaya work. But the importance of the MSV lies more in the fact that it presents for the first time extensive portions of these rules in a north Indian version. Previously, only fragments, plus versions of the Prātimokṣa Sūtra (published by Minayeff and Finot), had been known; otherwise only Tib. and Chinese translations were known. Tho not complete, MSV gives us extensive accounts of many parts of the Vinaya, which when compared with the Pali help us to get closer to the oldest forms of these rules. A noteworthy example is the important Kaṭhinavastu, describing the distribution of cloth presented to a monkish community by laymen, and distributed to the monks at the end of the rainy-season retreat, in an elaborate performance, some details of which are still not entirely clear even after comparison of the Pali and BHS (MSV) versions; the Tibetan and Chinese versions help, but seem to be themselves hard to interpret in spots.

An important northern canonical text is the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, edited on the basis of fragments from Chinese Turkestan by E. Waldschmidt (1950-51). Tho it arrived too late to be extensively excerpted in my Grammar and Dictionary, I managed to include (in the proof) a number of important words and forms. As in canonical Pali, and on the whole in similar terms, with few features that seem Mahāyāna-like, it tells the touching story of the Buddha's last days and death, as we should say, or *parinirvāṇa,* with related incidents after it. The editor has accompanied it with a valuable comparative study of all known versions of the story (Pali, BHS, Tibetan, and Chinese), and has made a plausible reconstruction of the original form of its most important parts. After wandering thru various provinces, Buddha came to the Malla country and was entertained at Pāpā (Pali Pāvā) by Cunda, a smith. In the Pali, Cunda's meal included *sūkaramaddava,* seemingly a pork dish; one Chinese version mentions mushrooms instead; the rest, including BHS, do not specify any food. In the following night, Buddha was attacked by dysentery; some versions seem to represent this as caused by what he ate at Cunda's house, but Waldschmidt thinks the original did not say so. In any event, sick as he was, he insisted on continuing his progress to Kuśinagarī (Pali Kusinārā). Near this town of the Mallas was a grove containing a pair of twin sal-trees. Being unable to go further, the aged Buddha had his couch laid between these twin trees, and knowing that his end had come, gave his last instructions to his followers. They should not feel bereft of their Teacher after his death, but should regard the doctrine and discipline (*dharma* and *vinaya*) which he had laid down as their Teacher. He then asked whether any monk had any doubt or uncertainty about any point of the religion; none had, which roused Ānanda's astonishment and delight. Finally—if we may trust Waldschmidt's reconstruction, which seems to me likely—in the original story, the old dying sage threw off his garment, revealing the ravages of age in his body, to teach them the lesson that even a Buddha's body is not exempt from decay. 'All states of being are transitory!—These were the last words of the Tathāgata.' I hope, at least, that Waldschmidt is right in his reconstruction, which is based on different accounts in the (some six or seven) northern versions and the southern (Pali) version. I can imagine no more magnificently impressive finale to the Buddha's career. He never spoke again, but sank into coma (interpreted as successive entry into a series of trances) which lasted for some time, and which the naive Ānanda mistook for death, but Aniruddha corrected him. At last he 'entered *parinirvāṇa*', amid portentous earthquakes, and lamentations of gods and men. His ashes, with unburnt fragments of wood, were distributed as sacred relics. We have learned above, from a Mahāvastu passage, of others of the striking and marvelous incidents which followed the *parinirvāṇa*.

The (Mahā)karmavibhaṅga is paralleled in Pali by Majjhima Nikāya 135, of which it might be regarded as an 'enlarged version' (Winternitz 618). Its theme is the inexorable effects of karma.

The Udāna-varga is a collection of edifying stanzas, incompletely preserved in fragments from Chinese Turkestan; it originally contained at least 32 chapters. Some of the verses preserved to us have not been found in Pali, but most of them occur there, in various places, chiefly Dhammapada, Udāna, and Suttanipāta.

The Jātakamālā, by Āryaśūra, is just a collection of former births of the Buddha, quite in the spirit of the Pali Jātaka book. There were many such collections. This one is distinguished by an exceptional mastery of literary art, in the fully developed, but not yet extreme or decadent, style of the Sanskrit kāvya, and containing both prose and verses. It is the one work included by me about which I feel some doubt as to whether it is really BHS. It contains a few—not many—non-Sanskrit forms, and a rather considerable number of non-Sanskrit words; enough, it seemed to me, to justify inclusion. One proper name, for instance, contains the Middle Indic participle *dinna* for Skt. *datta*, 'given'. If it belongs to this tradition, however, its author was certainly familiar with Sanskrit kāvya also, altho kāvya of a moderate type, highly artistic but not notably artificial. Some followers of the BHS tradition certainly knew the Jm, for one of its mss. contains one jātaka, printed by the editor in an Appendix, which like the Mahāvastu presents prose as well as verses in a thoroughly hybrid form. It is the only substantial piece we have of which this is true, outside of the Mahāvastu.

LECTURE 5

PRIMARILY MAHĀYĀNA TEXTS : THE SADDHARMAPUṆḌARĪKA

Of texts which belong fundamentally and exclusively to the Mahāyāna, the most important is unquestionably the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, 'Lotus of the Good (or, True) Law.' It was first translated into Chinese in 223 A.D., and is the favorite, the best-known and most universally authoritative, text of the Buddhists in China and Japan, to this day. Some parts, especially the last seven of its 27 chapters, seem to be later additions. If these and a few interpolations be ignored, the SP shows itself as a well-planned systematic introduction to the special dogmas of the Mahāyāna. From the literary point of view, too, it is one of the best in all BHS literature;only the Lalitavistara can be said to rival it in literary merit.

To be sure, some aspects of its style may not appeal to many moderns. It is leisurely, formulaic, and repetitious; it does not try to be concise or economical in style. Its use of vast numbers is characteristic of the Mahāyāna; common are such expressions as 'hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of *koṭis*' (a *nayuta* is a hundred billion; a *koṭi*, Modern Indian crore, is ten million), 'as many as the sands of the Ganges'. But this is not enough. In Chapter 15 the text wants to say that Śākyamuni really attained enlightenment a virtual infinity of aeons ago, not at the traditionally supposed time. (His nirvāṇa is not cessation of existence; he is from everlasting to everlasting, and his traditional life on earth is only a 'skillful device' (*upāya-kauśalya*), an appearance, to bring men to salvation.) How does it convey this notion? 'Assume the number of atoms of earth in fifty hundred thousand *nayutas* of crores of world-systems (*lokadhātu*). Suppose some man were to take a single such atom-speck, pass over fifty hundred thousand *asaṃkhyeyas* (an *asaṃkhyeya*, lit. "uncountable", is a stupendously large number—one followed by so many zeros that I have not tried to count) of world-systems to eastward, and deposit that one atom-speck; and in this manner, in the course of hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of crores of ages (*kalpa*), should remove all the earth from all those world-systems, and should deposit all those atom-specks of earth in this manner, by thus placing them on an assigned spot to eastward; what think you, could anyone conceive or count or weigh or determine those world-systems?' (The answer, naturally, is negative. The text then goes on:) 'I declare to you, as many as are the world-systems in which those atom-specks would be deposited by that man, and in which they would not be deposited, in all those hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of crores of world-systems, there are not as many atom-specks as there are hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of crores of ages since I attained perfect enlightenment.'

Such expressions, and there are others quite comparable, leave us stunned; which is doubtless just the effect the author intended. It became one of the characteristics of Mahāyāna doctrine, that what can be expressed in words is naught. The real truth is esoteric, and must be sought by other than verbal means.

But there are some parts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka which can justly claim high literary rank, judged by any standard. I refer especially to the parables which make up a considerable part of many of its chapters, and which, like those of the Christian gospels, illustrate religious lessons. They are, usually, much longer and more elaborate than those of Jesus. But most of them are equally apt and effective, and many are told in a very spirited and attractive way. I shall give you specimens later.

They, and as a rule the other parts of the text, are regularly told twice, first in prose, then in verses, sometimes with important divergences, which in my opinion, however, do not necessitate the assumption which many have made, that they were composed at different times and independently of each other. The author, like any good story-teller, may quite well have told the same story differently at different times. Each time he lets his creative fancy roam free; and when he finishes the two versions, he sees no reason to make them pedantically consistent with one another. He was a good poet, not a scholar who demands logical unity. His verses are much simpler than those of the Lalitavistara; in fact, the old and original parts of the text use only two meters, the ordinary *śloka,* and the *triṣṭubh-jagatī*, both familiar in Sanskrit, tho here they show the same special Middle Indic rules of metrics to which we referred in speaking of the LV and which are equally characteristic of BHS metrics in general. The author displays the same easy mastery of poetic art which the LV applies in its more elaborate metrical passages.

The SP opens with Śākyamuni on Mt. Vulture-peak in Rājagṛha, surrounded by 1200 arhant monks, 2000 other monks, 6000 nuns, 80,000 Bodhisattvas, '16 worthy men' (*satpuruṣa*; mentioned also in the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā, see Ensink,* 'Question of Rāṣṭrapāla', 2, n. 11, where it is reported that the Chinese translation declares they are Bodhisattvas), and also vast numbers of gods, nāgas, and other supernatural beings. After preaching to them he entered into a trance of meditation. Then from the circle of hair between his eyebrows emerged a ray which spread over 1,800,000 Buddha fields, down to the Avīci hell, and up to the peak of the universe, making visible all beings everywhere. The Bodhisattva Maitreya asked Mañjuśrī what this ray meant, and was told that it signified the Lord's intention to reveal a great Mahāyāna religious text, as a similar portent had once signified a past Buddha's intention to reveal the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka.

---

*Who refers to Lamotte, Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna, I. 428 n. 1.

In Chapter 2, the Buddha rises from his trance and speaks to Śāriputra. The true, esoteric message (i.e. Mahāyāna doctrine) of the Buddha is profound and hard to grasp; Hīnayānists and Pratyekabuddhas cannot comprehend it. For the prima-facie meaning of the Buddha is taught by him only as a clever device (*upāya-kauśalya*). Śāriputra is puzzled and asks a clearer statement, which the Lord at first refuses, saying that it would be incomprehensible and disturbing. Only after three requests does he consent. The Buddha uses reason and argument as a practical device, to entice the multitude, who can only comprehend Hīnayāna doctrine, into the fold. But his true meaning is not based on reason; it can only be learnt from the Buddha, whose sole real aim is to show perfect Buddha-knowledge to all creatures. This he does by the one, sole 'vehicle' (the Mahāyāna); there is no other vehicle. All Buddhas of the past, adapting their words to the mentality of creatures, have similarly spoken as tho reason (the Hīnayāna) were sufficient, but they too have really had in view the one Mahāyāna method, which ultimately leads to omniscience, that is Buddhahood. In periods of decay, a Buddha by his skillful devices speaks of salvation by three vehicles, suiting his words to the multiform mentality of creatures, tho in truth there is only one. That is, the true aim is not nirvāṇa, as in Hīnayāna, but Buddhahood for all. But since many cannot grasp this profundity, the weaker vessels are shown the lower Hīnayāna aim of individual nirvāṇa.

In Chapter 3 Śāriputra joyfully recognizes and accepts the lesson just proclaimed. He accuses himself, and others who have been content with the 'lesser vehicle', of superficiality and haste, in failing to grasp the Buddha's true, esoteric meaning, and thus to see that they, as all other men, may aspire not to mere personal nirvāṇa, but to omniscient Buddhahood, with its power of bringing salvation to all mankind. Confirming this, Śākyamuni then predicts Buddhahood for Śāriputra: 'In future time, when thru immeasurable, unthinkable, limitless ages thou hast held firm the True Law of many hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of crores of Buddhas, and paid manifold homage to them, and fulfilled this same Bodhisattva-course (taught in the Mahāyāna), thou shalt become a Tathāgata named Padmaprabha, an arhant, perfectly enlightened in the world, endowed with knowledge and right conduct, a Sugata, world-knowing, unsurpassed, a charioteer for human steeds-that-need-training, a teacher of gods and men, a Lord Buddha.' (This is the regular cliché which describes a Buddha.)

The audience, gods and men, hearing the prophecy, were thrilled with joy, and covered the Buddha with their own robes; celestial garments whirled through the air, musical instruments sounded in the sky, a great rain of flowers descended, and the audience cried: 'The first wheel of the law was set in motion by the Lord in the Deer-park at Banaras; but today the Lord has set in motion this second, unexcelled wheel of the law.'* The author may seem to us a trifle presumptuous in making his formulation equal or superior to the Buddha's First Sermon. But at least it presents in vivid light the novelty as well as supreme importance claimed by Mahāyāna followers for this, their cardinal doctrine. It is not only profound, esoteric, and supreme, it is also *new*. The following verse-account of this section puts this into the mouths of the audience: 'Abundant doctrine we have heard from the Lord of the World, yet never at any time have we previously heard such a doctrine as this.'

Śāriputra than tells the Buddha that his last doubt has been removed by the prophecy of his Buddhahood. But the monks in the assembly, who imagine that they are reaching nirvāṇa, have become unsettled by the new, unheard-of doctrine; will the Lord not dispel their uneasiness by further elucidation?

Have I not told you, Śāriputra (replies the Buddha), that I preach the law by skillful diplomatic devices, adapting my message to the understanding of men of various dispositions and inclinations, while with all my teachings I seek to inspire men to the Bodhisattva-vehicle alone, since I really have to do with only this supreme, perfect enlightenment? (That is, his ultimate meaning is that all men should strive to become Buddhas, not to enter nirvāṇa.) To make his meaning clearer he tells the Parable of the Burning House.

---

*The translators have not understood this sentence quite correctly.

A rich and aged householder lives in a house, large but in ruinous condition, infested with vermin and disgusting. Suddenly fire bursts out all over it. He has many sons, who run about and play in the house, unaware of their danger; tho he warns them of it, they do not heed him. He is strong, and could carry the children out. But the house has only one door; there is danger that the children, running all over the place, may not be saved in time. But children love toys. So he promises them three kinds of lovely toy carts, bullock-carts, goat-carts, and deer-carts, which he has outside the house. Now they eagerly rush out of the house, vying to see who will get out first. Then they ask their father for the three kinds of toy carts. But he is very rich, and loves all his children equally. So he gives them all large, beautifully-decorated bullock-carts only; why should he slight any by giving them smaller, inferior carts? Can he be called a deceiver, because he gives them all the largest and finest carts only? So the Buddha, in this world which is repulsive as the ruined house and aflame with the fires of misery, induces his ignorant sons, mankind, to leave it by promising three kinds of carts, appealing to their various tastes. But once they leave it, he gives them only the bullock-cart of the 'Great Vehicle', not the inferior 'carts' or 'vehicles' of the Disciples and Pratyekabuddhas. 'He does not declare an individual nirvāṇa for any creature, but brings all those creatures to nirvāṇa by the Great Nirvāṇa of a Buddha;......for he is able to show to all creatures the doctrine that goes with the Omniscient's knowledge.'

In Chapter 4, the disciples Mahā-Kātyayāna, Mahā-Kāśyapa, and Mahā-Maudgalyāyana express delight on hearing the prediction of Śāriputra's future Buddhahood, and bewail their former ignorance of the rich rewards of Mahāyāna. 'We are old, and fancy we have attained nirvāṇa, so that, indolent, we are not equal to striving for supreme perfect enlightenment. And now, to our amazement and joy, we learn from the Lord that even Disciples (Hīnayānists) may aspire to it, that is, to Buddhahood, which we never thought of seeking. We have acquired a magnificent jewel which we never even desired. Now it is all clear to us.' To illustrate this new understanding Kāśyapa tells the Parable of the Lost Heir.

A certain man left his home and spent many years abroad. His father meanwhile also went to another country, and became very rich. The son was abjectly poor; seeking a livelihood, he came once to the house of his father, who amid all his wealth had not ceased to long for his son, lost fifty years before. He did not recognize his father, but fled from his door to the poor quarter. The father however knew his son, but kept his own counsel, and sent servants to bring the poor man to him. He is brought in, terrified, and falls in a faint. The rich man sees that he must win his confidence gradually by a 'skillful device'. He has him released, and engages him to clean latrines in his own house.

The rich man gradually engages the confidence of the poor man, his own son, expressing satisfaction with his work, raising his pay, and offering him gratuities; he says, 'look upon me as a father; you shall be to me like a son.' In time, he initiates him into his business affairs, as a trusted helper. When his death approaches, at last he calls together his kindred and acquaintances, declares the poor man his own son, and makes him heir of all his wealth. The poor man is amazed; quite unexpectedly, and without ever having dreamed of it, he finds himself rich.

Just so the Buddha has now declared that these disciples are his 'sons' ('sons of the Buddha' is a standard Mahāyāna term for Bodhisattvas), tho previously their aspirations were low (mere personal nirvāṇa), as the son in the parable was content with his humble status. But now they have been unexpectedly declared heirs of all the Buddha's wealth, that is, omniscience and Buddhahood.

Chapter 5 contains three shorter parables, told by the Buddha to Kāśyapa. The Buddha is compared to a rain-cloud, which impartially sheds water on all plants, all of which suck in the water and utilize it variously, each for its own special development; and to the sun and moon, which shine impartially on all. The parable of the man born blind teaches that there is really only one nirvāṇa, namely that attained by Buddhahood, by omniscience, by the Mahāyāna; Hīnayāna-nirvāṇa 'is rest (*viśrāma*), not nirvāṇa. . . . Except omniscience, there is no nirvāṇa; attain that!' In Chapter 6 Buddhahood is predicted for Kāśyapa, Subhūti, and Maudgalyāyana. In Chapter 7 the point of the illusory and the true nirvāṇa is illustrated by the parable of the Continent of Jewels. A company of men is going thru a dense difficult forest (the world), led by a wise guide (the Buddha); but they get weary and afraid, and ask the guide to let them return. He wants to bring them thru to the Continent of Jewels (Mahāyāna salvation); but he now uses 'skillful diplomacy' and creates an illusory, magic city, in the midst of the forest, where they may temporarily rest. (This is Hīnayāna nirvāṇa.) After they have rested, he makes this mirage disappear, and leads them out to the one true goal, the Continent of Jewels.

Future Buddhahood is predicted for various other disciples. Even women, such as Gautamī and Śākyamuni's wife Yaśodharā, are predicted for Buddhahood in Chapter 12, of course with change of sex; for it is standard Buddhist doctrine that no female can become a cakravartin-king or a Buddha. Chapter 10 declares, in what must strike us as extravagantly exaggerated terms, the miraculous qualities of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka itself. Anyone who hears and accepts even a single stanza or word of it is sure to become a Buddha. This glorification of the text itself recurs repeatedly. In Chapter 11 a marvelous stūpa appears in mid-air. It belongs to a Buddha of long ago named Prabhūtaratna, who, because he had attained Buddhahood as a result of hearing the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, made a firm determination (*adhiṣṭhāna*) that whenever a future Buddha should recite the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, his own relic-stūpa should miraculously appear in the sky, and applaud the recitation. The audience hears this applause coming from the stūpa in the sky, and one Bodhisattva asks to see the form of the Buddha whose relics are contained in it. Thereupon, Śākyamuni sends forth a ray from the circle of hair between his eyebrows (*ūrṇākośa,* one of the marks of a mahāpuruṣa). This reveals all the Buddhas stationed in fifty hundred thousand *nayutas* of crores of world-systems to the east, as many as the sands of the Ganges, and all the Buddha-fields there, marvelously adorned and all full of hundreds of thousands of Bodhisattvas; so also in each of the nine other directions of the sky. All these innumerable Buddhas resolve to come with attendants to the Buddha Śākyamuni in the Sahā-world to salute the relic-stūpa of Prabhūtaratna; they do so, and each sits down on a jewelled throne under a marvelous jewel-tree. On this occasion all the inhabitants of the world, except the audience at this vision, are magically transported to other worlds to make room for these visitors; while Śākyamuni creates by magic for the visiting Buddhas twenty hundred thousands of *nayutas* of crores of Buddha-fields, all marvelously adorned, and arranges them all in the shape of a single Buddha-field. As if this were not enough, Śākyamuni creates by magic many other forms of Buddhas, preaching the Law to countless creatures, and causes them also to appear in presence, so that thirty crores of worlds in each direction are occupied by Buddha-forms. All of them send their retainers and ask Śākyamuni to open the great stūpa of Prabhūtaratna.

After all these preparations, Śākyamuni rises from his seat, places himself aloft in the sky, and with a finger of his right hand opens the stūpa. There is seen the Buddha Prabhūtaratna, tho he had long since entered nirvāṇa, seated cross-legged on a throne, as if in meditation; he praises the Buddha Śākyamuni for his exposition of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, and invites him to share his seat, which he does. Śākyamuni's followers shower both Buddhas with flowers, and wish that the Buddha might lift them into the sky to be near the two Buddhas, which unexpressed wish is immediately granted by Śākyamuni. This supernal vision is described in terms the ornate eloquence of which I can hardly more than hint at. According to the following chapters, the scene remains fixed during all the rest of the incidents told in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. All take place in the presence of the Buddha Prabhūtaratna, tho he had long since entered nirvāṇa, as the text never fails to remind us on the half dozen occasions in later chapters when he is mentioned as viewing, or even actively participating in, the events described. At the very end of the work (which, to be sure, is very likely a late addition), Śākyamuni bids farewell to all the Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and disciples whom he has drawn into his presence, by magic or otherwise, politely wishing them, literally, 'a state of dwelling in comfort'; and the same courteous wish is directed towards the long-since 'extinguished' (*parinirvṛta*) Buddha Prabhūtaratna.

Before leaving the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka let me try to give you a notion of its style, by translating as faithfully as I can one of its shorter parables. This will bring us back to the beginning of today's lecture, in which I quoted the author's attempt to suggest the virtual infinity of ages since Śākyamuni actually became enlightened. How, then, about the well-known canonical account of his enlightenment at Bodh Gaya, a few hundred years before the date of the

Saddharmapuṇḍarīka? Can that account be false? The Buddha explains his proceedure to the Bodhisattvas he is now addressing by the following parable.

It is, sirs, as if there were some man that is a physician, learned, trained, intelligent, skilled in curing all diseases. Suppose this man has many sons, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, or a hundred. This physician is gone abroad, and all his sons become infected with poison or venom. This poison or venom makes them suffer grievous pains; they fall in agony on the ground. Then the physician, their father, returns from abroad. And some of those sons of his, who are suffering grievous pains owing to the poison or venom, have perverted notions, while others have unperverted notions; but they are all suffering the same pains. When they see their father they greet him joyfully and say: How lucky it is that you have come back safe and well, father! Now cure us from this poison or venom that troubles us; save our lives, father! So when that physician sees his sons in agony, tormented by pains and rolling on the ground, he fixes a powerful medicine, which has the right color, smell, and taste, pulverizes it on a stone, and gives it to his sons to drink, saying: My sons, drink this powerful medicine, which has the right color, smell, and taste; if you drink it you will right quickly be cured of this poison or venom, and will be sound and well. Now those of the physician's sons who are of unperverted notions, they, seeing the color and smelling the smell and tasting the taste of the medicine, quickly take it, and in so doing are completely cured of that illness. But those sons who are of perverted notions, greet their father and say: How lucky it is that you have come back safe and well, father! You who are our healing physician! While they speak thus, they do not drink the proffered medicine; why not? Because, on account of their perverted notions, they do not like that proffered medicine, either because of its color, or its smell, or its taste. Now, you see, that physician reflects: These sons of mine have notions that are perverted by reason of this poison or venom. Here they are, not drinking this powerful medicine; and yet they greet me joyfully. Suppose now I induce these my sons to drink this medicine by a skillful device.

Then that physician, thinking to induce his sons to drink the medicine by a skillful device, says: I am old and decrepit, my sons, and my hour of death approaches. Grieve not, and be not faint-hearted. Here is a powerful medicine that I have fixed for you; if you wish, drink this medicine. Having thus given directions to his sons by a skillful device, he goes off to a different part of the country, and when he gets there lets it be reported to those sick sons that he is dead. At this they are greatly distressed, and they loudly lament: He who was our father and lord, our compassionate parent, he had to be the one to die! Now we are left helpless! Now, you see, regarding themselves as helpless and without any refuge, they are constantly plunged in grief; and because of this constant distress their perverted notions become unperverted. And they come to realize that the color, smell and taste of that medicine are simply nothing but its color, smell, and taste. Then, at this point, they take that medicine, and in so doing are cured of that illness. Then, of course, when that physician knows that his sons are cured of the illness, he shows himself again.

Now what think you, sirs? Isn't there danger that some one might accuse that physician of lying, when he devises that skillful device? They said: Not at all, Lord! Said he: Just so, sirs, I too have been enlightened unto supreme perfect enlightenment numberless, countless hundreds of thousands of *nayutas* of crores of ages ago, and yet from time to time I display such skillful devices as these to train creatures; and I am not guilty of any lying in this respect.

LECTURE 6

OTHER MAHĀYĀNA WORKS; DEVELOPMENT OF MAHĀYĀNA BUDDHISM

In one of the late and probably apocryphal chapters of the SP (Chap. 24), the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara is glorified. This personage soon became one of the leading figures of Mahāyāna mythology. He is the principal figure in the Kāraṇḍa-vyūha, more fully Avalokiteśvara-guṇa-kāraṇḍa-vyūha, 'supernal manifestation (my Dictionary s. v. *vyūha*) of the basket of qualities of A.' He is the prime example of a true Bodhisattva, who refuses to attain Buddhahood until all beings are saved. The name perhaps means 'the lord who looks down', sc. with infinite pity on all beings. His task is to rescue all beings from suffering. He will even descend to the Avīci hell to mitigate the torment of its inhabitants; when he appears there its pains are changed to delights. A special secret of his is the famous 'six-syllable formula', *om maṇi padme hum,* the magic power of which is extravagantly glorified in the second part of the Kāraṇḍa-vyūha.

The Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara is closely associated with the Mahāyānistic Buddha Amitābha (also Amitāyus, and other forms), who rules the 'Land of Bliss' (Sukhāvatī, with or sc. *lokadhātu*), a kind of paradise in the west, which one may attain who does abundant good works and directs his thoughts to enlightenment, and especially who thinks of Amitābha at the hour of death. The glories and joys of this land, which became very popular in northern Buddhism, are set forth in the Sukhāvatī-vyūha, which exists in two BHS versions and was often translated into Chinese. In it Avalokiteśvara appears as questioner and interlocutor of the Buddha Amitābha.

Besides Avalokiteśvara, there are other individual Bodhisattvas renowned in Mahāyāna works. Maitreya, who will be the next Buddha after Śākyamuni, is known already in Pali (Metteyya), where, as in BHS, he has the stock epithet Ajita, 'the unconquered'; he is also well-known in northern Hīnayāna works, including the Mahāvastu. He is prominent in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka and other Mahāyāna texts, too. Of new and exclusively Mahāyāna Bodhisattvas, one of the most celebrated is Mañjuśrī, who is perpetually young, and has the stock epithet *kumāra-bhūta*. This leads to a curious blending of him with the Hindu god Kumāra = Skanda or Kārttikeya, in the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, of which he is the leading personage. His mantra, which includes within itself all 'science' or magic, enables its possessor to do anything he likes. This text is, in fact, not much more than a 'manual of magic', as Winternitz truly says (II. 397). It nevertheless has considerable importance, linguistically at least, and would have much more if the text were not so deplorably corrupt, almost beyond belief, even for a BHS text.

Mañjuśrī is prominent already in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, and much more so in other Mahāyāna works, such as the Gaṇḍavyūha. This long work is an exemplification of the search for the 'Bodhisattva-course'. A young banker's son named Sudhana conceives the idea of striving for enlightenment. He applies for advice to Mañjuśrī, who commends his ambition, and advises him to seek to learn the 'course of Bodhisattvas', *bodhisattvānāṃ caryā* (in verses, *carī* or *cari*), which will lead to enlightenment and Buddhahood, by seeking out 'good friends', *kalyāṇa-mitrāṇi*, who will help him. This notion of 'good friends' is the major theme of the Gaṇḍavyūha, and is also familiar in other Mahāyāna treatises. A 'good friend' is one who has made progress in some aspect of the true doctrine, and whose sympathetic counsel will help the aspirant for the 'bodhisattva-course'. Sudhana is directed successively to over fifty such individuals, in all parts of India. Each one tells Sudhana what he has learned, but confesses its inadequacy, and sends him on to someone else, who may know more about the 'bodhisattva-course'. They are a very miscellaneous lot: monks, sages, kings, brahmans, householders, merchants, bodhisattvas, deities, slaves, boys, girls, 'Gopā the Śākya-girl', 'Queen Māyā'. The name Gaṇḍa-vyūha perhaps means 'supernal manifestation in (many small) sections'; these interviews with *kalyāṇa-mitrāṇi* make up the bulk of the text.

Near the end of this text a very long section is devoted to 'the Bodhisattva Maitreya', who praises Sudhana's zeal and devotion, reveals certain supernal mysteries to him, and finally sends him back to Mañjuśrī again. Mañjuśrī praises Sudhana and says he is now properly trained. In the last prose section, as a result of this training, there appears to him, preceded by miraculous portents, a mystic vision of the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra. In this vision is revealed to Sudhana the *Samantabhadra-bodhisattva-caryā-praṇidhāna* 'earnest wish (or vow) for Samantabhadra's (or, by word-play, the completely excellent) bodhisattva-course'. The Gaṇḍavyūha then closes with a poem of 'sixty-two melodious *dodhaka* stanzas, which ranks among the most beautiful expressions of Buddhist piety' (Winternitz II. 326), which is also well-known as an independent text, commonly called the Bhadracarīpraṇidhāna, or Bhadracarī for short. In it the bodhisattva makes an 'earnest wish or vow' (*praṇidhāna*; the verbs are first person singular) that, after paying boundless obeisance to all Buddhas, showing love to all beings, remembering all his former births, practising the perfections (*pāramitā*), getting rid of all evil obstructions (*āvaraṇa*), working to remove unhappiness from the entire world, associating with good friends who show him the way of the Bhadracarī, with special mention of the bodhisattvas Mañjuśrī and Samantabhadra, he may go to the region of Sukhāvatī and behold the Buddha Amitābha, and receive from him the prediction of future Buddhahood. The last verse prays, in the spirit of the true bodhisattva, that all the infinite merit he may acquire by pursuing the 'excellent course' (*bhadracarī*) may result, not in any boon to himself, but in the attainment of that same city of Amitābha on the part of the whole world that is plunged in the flood of evil.—Samantabhadra is a well-known bodhisattva in other Mahāyāna works, too. But it seems that his prime importance, surpassing even that of Mañjuśrī and Maitreya, in the Gaṇḍavyūha may be due to the convenient word-play on his name when it is prefixed to *caryā* or *carī*, since the name means 'completely excellent, noble, fair'.

The more metaphysical treatises of northern Buddhism tend to prefer standard Sanskrit as a medium, but some of them use BHS. Among these may be mentioned the Daśabhūmika-sūtra, which clothes its philosophy (much of it quite abstruse) in the form of a description of the ten 'stages' of a bodhisattva, and the Bodhisattvabhūmi, a prose work of *abhidharma* style. There is a class of works called Prajñā-pāramitā, '(treatises on) the supremacy or perfection of knowledge or wisdom,' which treat of the six 'supremacies' but especially that of *prajñā,* the sixth, which consists of knowledge of *śūnyatā,* 'emptiness', viz. that all conditions of being are fundamentally unreal or insubstantial, a favorite Mahāyāna doctrine which has its roots in Pali. Two of these treatises are included in my work, the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, 'of 8000' (*ślokas,* i.e., units of 32 syllables; the texts are prose), and the Śatasāhasrikā, 'of 100,000' (*ślokas*). It is reported that a Prajñā-pāramitā was translated into Chinese as early as 179 A.D. But the texts now preserved in BHS appear to be much later. To this category also belongs the Vajrachedikā (-prajñāpāramitā), a brief statement of the *śūnyatā* doctrine, of which a good summary in English is furnished by Max Müller in SBE 49, Part 2, p. xiv ff.

Another text containing further developments of this *śūnyatā* doctrine is the Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra, which is highly abstruse and paradoxical in many of its statements. As now extant, it consists of ten chapters of very unequal length and diverse character; chapters 1 and 8-10 seem clearly late additions to a kernel consisting of 2 to 7. It teaches the system known as Vijñāna-vāda, admitting a subjective reality to the *ālaya-vijñāna,* 'basal consciousness', which is distinguished from *pravṛtti-vijñāna,* 'evolvent or active consciousness'. Much of what it says seems not only anti-verbal, but anti-rational, anti-intellectual.

The Suvarṇaprabhāsa or Suvarṇabhāsottama Sūtra also expounds *śūnyatā.* In the second chapter it declares that a Buddha's body is 'spiritual' only, not material, so that no genuine relics of the Buddha can exist.* It glorifies its own text magniloquently, and treats it as a *dhāraṇī,* magic formula. It has a passage on the six *dhātu* of the body, of importance for Hindu medicine (Nobel, JAOS, Supplement 11 to Vol. 71 No. 3, 1951).

The Samādhirāja or Candrapradīpa Sūtra teaches the attainment of supreme enlightenment by *samādhis,* 'trances' or 'meditations', with preliminary conditions which prepare one for this. These include worship of Buddhas, renunciation of the world, kindness to all beings, self-sacrifice, and firm knowledge of the unreality (*śūnyatā*) of phenomena. It contains some very fine didactic passages.

The Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā, Question of Rāṣṭrapāla, deals first with Buddha's answer to the disciple Rāṣṭrapāla, who asked him to describe the origin and nature of the Bodhisattva course. The answer is a relatively brief schematic statement of all that a true bodhisattva should and should not be and do. First, one may hope for bodhisattvahood when

---

*The word *dharmakāya* is here used in sense (4) of my Dictionary, s.v.; not with *saṃbhoga* and *nirmāṇa-kāya.* Winternitz II. 340 erroneously assumes reference to these three *kāyas* of the Buddha, which seem to be only very late, even in the Mahāyāna; I have found the triad only in the Mahāvyutpatti among texts excerpted by me. Not even a *rūpakāya,* q.v. in Dictionary, is admitted, or so much as mentioned, in the passage under discussion.

he is possessed of four qualities: proper behavior (*pratipatti*) with his whole disposition and intent, thinking (himself) the same as all beings, realization of emptiness (*śūnyatā*), and keeping his word. (These are described in several stanzas; similarly with all the following sets of—always four—categories.) Next come four qualities by which he gets encouragement: magic formulas, good friends, receptivity to the doctrine, and spotless moral conduct. Then follow four things that cause him joy: seeing a Buddha, hearing the doctrine that is conformable (to religious progress), abandoning all possessions, receptivity to the knowledge that states-of-existence have no conceivable content and so no real existence. To four things he must be indifferent: living in houses, profit and honors, association with families, the body and life. Four things do not cause him repentance: not breaking the moral commandments, not abandoning forest-dwelling (?), conforming to the four attitudes of the saint (*āryavaṃśa*), attainment of great (religious) learning. He must follow four 'gaits (or, conditions) of noble (human) steeds': attainment of a good 'gait' (or, condition), which comes by coincidence (of birth) with the birth of a Buddha; obedience to a Teacher, by unselfish spiritual service; delight in sleeping and sitting in solitary places, without interest in profit and honors; and attainment of inspired presence of mind by having receptivity to the profound doctrine. Four things purify the bodhisattva-course: no loss of unimpeded practical knowledge; dwelling in the forest when one is free from hypocrisy, boasting (of religious qualities), and extortion by threats; constant love of the doctrine and not seeking a reward after giving away all possessions; and not hunting for faults in preachers of the doctrine. There are four pitfalls for him: lack of respect (for those to whom it is due); ingratitude and practice of deceit; coveting profit and honors; and the extraction of profit and honors by hypocrisy and boasting (of religious qualities). There are four things that block the way to enlightenment for him: lack of faith, indolence, pride, and thoughts of jealousy and envy when others are praised. Four (types of) persons he must not cultivate: an evil friend, a holder of the heretical view of reliance on mental concepts (as, that there is a soul), one who contemns the true doctrine, and one who is greedy for worldly things. Four things have evil results for him: injuring (text uncertain, perhaps despising) others by (reason of) his knowledge, thoughts of envy and jealousy, lack of zeal, and striving after enjoyments thru receptivity to unpurified knowledge. There are four bonds for him: contempt for others; notions based on (superficial, false) appearances (resulting in) practice of realization (of one's goal) by worldly means; cleaving to negligence because he is bereft of knowledge and his thoughts are uncontrolled; and association with families when his mind is attached thereto.

All these positive and negative aspects of the bodhisattva course were pursued by Śākyamuni in countless previous existences. The text proceeds to refer briefly to many such jātaka stories, some unidentified elsewhere. Mostly they exemplify boundless self-sacrifice due to supreme love for all beings. By contrast, we next read an excoriation of deluded and evil monks who, apparently in the present age, refuse to accept the Mahāyāna doctrine, denying that it is the true doctrine of the Buddha. With what I would venture to call typical European partisanship, fortunately for India less common there, these Hīnayāna monks are accused of every vice and immorality, in a long series of almost fifty stanzas, which threaten them with dire punishments in future births. Here ends the first of the two halves of the Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā. At the beginning of its second part, we have another section on evil and pretended Bodhisattvas, which suggests that even Mahāyānists proved not infrequently unworthy and corrupt, in the opinion of the Jeremiah who composed this curious and very interesting book. Soon, however, he drops this theme, and devotes all the rest of the book to telling at length a jātaka, the story of Śākyamuni's former birth as Puṇyaraśmi, which was already briefly alluded to in the list of jātakas in Part I, as well as barely named in a similar list in the Lalitavistara. This seems to be the only known place where it is told in full.

The Kāśyapa-parivarta, of which we have an edition based on a single incomplete manuscript from Central Asia, is said to have been translated into Chinese in the 2nd century A.D. It was, according to Tibetan and Chinese sources, a part of, or according to its own text perhaps identical with, the Ratnakūṭa (-sūtra), and is cited under this name in the Śikṣāsamuccaya and elsewhere. If it is so old, it would be one of the oldest Mahāyāna works we have. This would make it important for a number of reasons; among them, with its doctrine of the 'middle course', *madhyamā pratipad,* it anticipates the Mādhyamika school of the philosophers Nāgārjuna and Āryadeva. As stated in the KP, it is the doctrine that things are e.g., 'neither eternal nor not eternal', neither one thing (regarded as an 'extreme', *anta*) nor its opposite. There is an evident echo here from the First Sermon of the Buddha, but there these terms were only ethical in content, not ontological. The KP consists of a dialog, almost a monolog, in which Buddha expounds to Kāśyapa the qualities of a Bodhisattva and the doctrine of nullity (*śūnyatā*), with the use of many similes and brief parables, resembling the shorter ones of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka. As in that text, a prose section is regularly followed by one which states the same thing in verse. The language is typical BHS, and even the prose (like that of the Central Asiatic version of the SP and its like, see above) contains more Middle Indic and hybrid forms than the prose of most BHS texts in their later (Nepalese or Japanese) forms. An extreme glorification of the Mahāyāna ideal of the bodhisattva is found in this passage (§ 88); 'As the new moon is revered and the full moon not so much, so those who believe in me should revere a bodhisattva far more than a Buddha, because Buddhas arise from bodhisattvas.'

The Śikṣāsamuccaya, 'Summation of Instruction', by Śāntideva, is a work unique in character. It consists of 27 *kārikās* (memorial verses), with a bulky commentary by the author, which is almost wholly made up of quotations from older Mahāyāna treatises. With becoming modesty, the author says at the outset that he has 'nothing new to say here, neither have I any skill in the writing of literary works'. The first part of this sentence is certainly true; the work has no originality. It has however great importance in other ways. It always identifies the works it quotes. Many are known to us (*e.g.* the Lalitavistara, Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Gaṇḍavyūha, Laṅkāvatāra, etc.), and Śāntideva's readings are often very helpful in correcting errors in our manuscripts and editions. Even more important are the numerous quotations from lost works, not known to exist in Indic languages (some are found in northern translations). Of special linguistic interest is one short quotation from a 'Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka', which until recently was believed lost.* It consists of a few lines of prose, which is exactly like that of the Mahāvastu, that is thoroughly hybrid in character. This, and the short jātaka printed as an appendix to the edition of the Jātakamālā (above), are the only examples we have to prove that such prose once existed in other texts than Mv.

The first two *kārikās* give, in Winternitz's words (2.367) 'the fundamental idea of the work and the nucleus of Mahāyāna morality'; Winternitz renders them:

'If to my neighbor as myself
Fear and pain are hateful,
In what does my ego differ
That I should guard it more than another's?
Do you wish to attain the end of suffering,

---

*It has recently been recovered among some manuscripts brought from Tibet, and now lodged at Patna University, where it is being prepared for publication by Professor A. S. Altekar and assistants.

And the goal of happiness?
Then let your faith be as a firmly planted root,
And direct your mind towards enlightenment.'

Many of its quotations deal with the *bodhi-citta,* 'thought of' or 'will to enlightenment'. One who conceives it, in order to pursue the course effectively, must say (in words quoted from a lost Vajradhvaja-sūtra): 'I take the sufferings of all beings upon myself......I bear them, I do not turn back, I do not fly, I do not shudder, I do not quake, I do not fear, I do not shrink back and do not despair. ....For I have vowed to deliver all beings....from the jungle of birth.... of heresy,....of the loss of good morals, from the jungle which has grown up thru ignorance, from all jungles.... I am not concerned with my own liberation only. For with the boat of the resolve towards omniscience, I must rescue all beings from the misery of *saṃsāra*....I am resolved to spend endless myriads of ages in every single place of torture......Because it is better that I alone suffer, than that all these beings should sink into the places of torture. I must give myself as ransom....'

Besides compassion, the perfections (*pāramitā*) must all be cultivated, especially meditation, which leads to supreme wisdom, viz. realization of *śūnyatā,* the unreality of phenomena, and faith, which is expressed in worship of the Buddhas, including building of stūpas, etc. But in all these activities he must constantly be thinking: 'May I lead all beings to the city of nirvāṇa!'

LECTURE 7

THE POSITION OF BHS AMONG MIDDLE INDIC DIALECTS

The remaining four lectures in this course will deal with some of the more striking and important features of the BHS language, which I have treated more technically and in much greater detail, for the use of scholars, in my Grammar. As in that work, I shall deal here only with non-Sanskrit, that is Middle Indic or hybrid, features. Some of them are general Middle Indic, found in all or nearly all the dialects, like the assimilation of other consonants to adjoining stops: e.g. *yutta* for Skt. *yukta*. Others are more limited in occurrence. Some are entirely isolated, not paralleled in any other dialect known to us. As I said in my first lecture, we cannot localize the language geographically, nor can we identify it with any other extant Middle Indic dialect; various attempts have been made to do this, but they have all clearly failed. This is shown by the fact that a number of well-established features of BHS are found nowhere else. It seems worth while first to list some of these, which refute all attempts at identification with any other dialect. (See my Grammar, §§ 1.83-105). I include also some forms of very limited occurrence elsewhere.

In the locative singular of *a*-stem nouns the ending *-esmiṃ* or *-esmin,* also *esmi*, is very common. It varies with *-asmiṃ* etc., which occurs in Pali (derivatives also in Prakrit), and which is obviously a transfer from the pronouns; for Skt. *tasmin loke,* Pali and BHS substitute *tasmiṃ lokasmiṃ.* The further BHS change to (*lok*)*esmiṃ* is an evident blend-form, a cross between *lokasmiṃ* and *loke.* Some editors of BHS texts have eliminated the ending *esmiṃ* by emendation, in spite of its frequent occurrence in the manuscripts. I may add that BHS also often has (*lok*)*i* for (*lok*)*e,* almost invariably in verses where meter requires a short final syllable;

it is recorded in Apabhraṃśa, but apparently not in any older Middle Indic, except rarely in inscriptions.

In the nominative plural of feminine *ā*-stems, both nouns and pronouns, occurs an ending *āvo*; e.g., *tāvo* = Skt. *tās*. (Once also a masculine form *āvusāvo* occurs, used as vocative.) I have found it only in the Mahāvastu, our oldest text; all later texts seem to have eliminated it. It is probably related to the ending *-āyo*, as in *tāyo*, which is commoner than *-āvo* in BHS and occurs in Pali (*tāyo*), and probably also in the form *-āo* in Prakrit (there is a different theory about the origin of this form).

Also limited to the Mahāvastu are *r*-stem forms in *-are*, *-ari* (*mātare*, *mātari*), functioning in any oblique case of the singular. Since *-are* is commoner than *-ari*, and neither is limited to the locative, I do not think we can assume the Skt. locative, e.g. *mātari*, as the starting point. Instead these are probably formed in analogy to *-iye*, general oblique case-form of *i* and *ī*-stems (in Prakrit regularly *-īe*).

Again peculiar to the Mahāvastu, but extremely common there, is a genitive plural pronoun *sānaṃ*, 'of them', = Skt. *teṣām*, *tāsām*. It occurs nowhere else. We may compare the general Middle Indic and BHS *se*, genitive singular (= *tasya*, *tasyās*), formed on the stem of *sa*, *sā*, with the ending of *me*, *te*; *sānam* is a plural made to fit this singular. The short *a* of the final syllable is regular Middle Indic.

There is a third-plural optative and aorist ending *-etsu* or *-etsuḥ*, extremely common in the Mahāvastu, tho always emended by Senart; and also found in other, later texts. Outside of Mv, it is usually replaced in the aorist by *-iṣu*, precisely paralleled only in Aśokan inscriptions; cf. Skt. *-iṣuḥ* and Pali *-isum*; or, less often, by *-iṃsu* (so also Pali and Ardhamāgadhī).

Very often in the Mahāvastu, and occasionally in other texts, the augment *a-*, in Skt. only with imperfect and aorist verb forms, is prefixed to present tense forms; this is specially common with forms of *bhāṣ*, 'speak'. Even an optative form is thus augmented. Pali has a very few such forms.

The root *gam*, 'go', has a future *gaṃsati*, quite common in the Mahāvastu, not noted elsewhere in BHS, and seemingly not precisely paralleled elsewhere.

The regular, and in most texts extremely common, aorist of the root *bhū* is *abhūṣi*, rarely Sanskritized as *abhūṣīt*. No other dialect has such a form.

Also entirely unparalleled is the present *sthihati*, from the root *sthā*, for Skt. *tiṣṭhati*. It is common in most texts, and its Middle Indic original, which was doubtless *thihati* or *ṭhihati*, would seem to have been the regular present of this root in the original Prakrit. Pali has *ṭhahati*, represented in BHS by *sthahati*, which is much rarer; *sthihati* seems to be a modification of this, with *i* of the radical vowel by blending with *sthitaḥ* or *tiṣṭhati*. Probably based on imitation of *sthihati* is the present **dhihati* to root *dhā*, implied in the aorist *saṃ-dhihe*, which is recorded only once.

Peculiar to BHS seems to be the substitution of final *-o* for *-a*. It is not a phonetic change but due to morphological analogy; final *-a* for *-o* is extremely common, and led to this reflex back-formation. In BHS final *-as* and *-am* both are very often replaced (but almost exclusively in verses where a short syllable is required) by *-u* (as well as *-a*); this is not found in normal Pali or Prakrit, but is not unparalleled; it is common in Apabhraṃśa and in certain other Middle Indic dialects, notably the northwestern Prakrit of the ms. Dutreuil de Rhins.

The gerund ending *-i* is another form in which BHS agrees with Apabhraṃśa; it seems to be unknown in older Middle Indic.

Similarly BHS has a special vocative plural ending of *a*-stems, *-āho* (e.g. *kulaputrāho*, 'gentlemen!'), known to Apabhraṃśa in the forms *-aho*, *-ahu*, and also in Māgadhī Prakrit as *-āho*.

Instead of Skt. *udapādi* (aorist passive to *utpadyate*), 'was produced' and so 'originated, came into being', which seems aberrant and bizarre in the Middle Indic aorist, the Mahāvastu has quite commonly an interesting blend-form *udapāsi*. It is adapted to aorist forms in *-si,* which in BHS and Middle Indic generally are regular from roots or stems in long vowels; such as *ajñāsi, adāsi, asthāsi.* (The Sanskrit relic-form *udapādi* is also common, as it is in Pali.) It seems to be recorded nowhere else.

More attention should perhaps be accorded to a comparison between BHS and Pali than was done in my Grammar. Pali, the sacred language of Southern Buddhism, was a North Indian Middle Indic. It was certainly the dialect spoken in one of the localities to which early missionaries carried Buddhism and where thriving Buddhist centers were established. Its original home has been much disputed in the past; nowadays it has come to be rather generally held that it was the region of Ujjayinī. Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit was based on another such local dialect; we have no idea where it was spoken. To such localities, and there were doubtless many others, came Buddhist monks, who may have been themselves of very different origins, bringing with them a sort of canon: a body of sermons, sayings in prose and verse, narratives of the Buddha's life and of his previous incarnations, and rules laid down for the conduct of monks and nuns. Many of these canonical works no doubt went back to the earliest times, and were carried everywhere in similar forms; but there is, as we saw in our first lecture, no reason to assume linguistic unity even in the texts as they were thus spread by missionaries; there is no reason to assume *any* single 'original language of Buddhism'. And whatever the dialects of the missionaries may have been, the sacred texts were soon adapted to the speech native to each locality. Thus various Buddhist 'canons', at first loose and fluid, sprang up all over North India. The only ones of which we know much today were those of Pali and BHS; a small fragment of a third is found in the 'manuscript Dutreuil de Rhins'.

In some BHS works, especially the Mahāvastu, the

Lalitavistara, the Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra, and a few Prātimokṣa and other Vinaya texts, we find passages, in both prose and verse, which correspond more or less closely to passages of the Pali canon. (Many others which no longer exist in Indic are found in Tibetan and Chinese translations.)

In such passages the vocabulary used in Pali and in BHS is very largely identical, tho the phonetic and grammatical forms are different. This is natural, for both were inherited from a common tradition older than either. Neither was translated from the other; each was adapted independently to the dialect of its locality, but used a word-stock that was to a considerable extent identical. And such words, common to both, continued to be used in both languages in new compositions dealing with the Buddhist religion, which were composed in the separate monkish communities where Pali and BHS flourished.

This explains the fact that there is a very extensive agreement in vocabulary between Pali and BHS. They have a great many words in common, and many of these words are not used, at least with the same meanings, in Sanskrit, or often even in other Middle Indic dialects. They are words inherited from the dialects in which the oldest Buddhist traditions were handed down. Nor are they by any means limited to technical terms of the Buddhist religion. Equally common are words which belonged to ordinary secular language.

But when we examine the phonology and especially the grammar of Pali and BHS, we find a very different situation. I ignore the Sanskritization of BHS; that is of course relatively late and secondary, and in any case irrelevant to the point we are discussing, since it cannot have affected the underlying Middle Indic. Generally speaking the non-Sanskrit (Middle Indic or hybrid) forms of BHS show no peculiar affinity to Pali. The two languages agree, mostly, only in so far as they are both Middle Indic, and share the features of all, or most, Middle Indic dialects. Special features of Pali phonology and grammar, which distinguish it from other Middle Indic dialects, are for the most part not found in BHS. Conversely, various Middle Indic features of BHS are unknown in Pali, tho some of them are well known in other Middle Indic dialects. This proves the linguistic independence of the two dialects. The Prakrit underlying BHS was very different from Pali.

Let me illustrate this by a few examples. A special feature of Pali phonology is the substitution of *-bb-* for a common Middle Indic *-vv-*; there is no case of it in BHS. In the declension of nouns, Pali very commonly uses in the ablative singular the pronominal ending *-smā* (or *-mhā*), e.g. *lokasmā, lokamhā*; and by extension *aggismā, bhikkhusmā,* or °*mhā*. The only trace of such an ending which I have found in BHS is a single form *agārasmā,* corruptly indicated once in the Mahāvastu. Another Pali peculiarity is the use of *u*-stem forms in the *n*-declension (*rājūhi, rājūnaṃ, rājūsu*); nothing of the sort is noted in BHS. When a Pali inflectional form is found also in BHS, it is usually a general Middle Indic form, or at least occurs in other dialects.

Conversely, there are forms which are standard and common in BHS but not found in Pali at all. Some were listed earlier in this lecture; these are found elsewhere not at all, or only in very restricted areas. But others are common in general Prakrit, tho lacking in Pali. Thus, in noun declension, the ablative *-āto* (and variants) =general Pkt. *-ādo, -āo,* and similarly BHS *-īto, -ito* from *i*-stems. There is a common oblique feminine *-āye, -īye, -ūye* (and variants), *cf.* general Pkt. *-āe, -īe, -ūe*; all are unknown in Pali, which has instead *-āya* (also common in BHS, but cf. general Pkt. *-āa*; this can hardly be counted a specific agreement of BHS and Pali), and *-iyā, -uyā,* instead of which BHS commonly has *-īya, -ūya,* closer to general Pkt. *-īa, -ūa.* Personal pronouns show quite a number of curious and interesting forms lacking in Pali; some of them occur hardly, or not at all, elsewhere. Some are so rare as to be somewhat doubtful in BHS, but the following seem sufficiently sure: *maye, tvaye* (also *mayi, tvayi*) as instrumental singular, *cf.* Pkt. *mae, tae* (*mai, tai*); *mo* for *no* as accusative, genitive, and even nominative plural; rare and textually not always certain are *tuṣphe* as nominative plural (=*yūyam*) and *tusphehi* or *tuspehi* as instrumental plural, which recall Aśokan *tuphe, tuphehi.* Like Prakrit, but unlike Pali, BHS has nominative singular masculine and feminine *imo, imā,* for Skt. *ayam, iyam*; matching the rest of the declension in Pali, Pkt., and BHS (*imena, imasya* etc.) alike.

In the verb inflection, BHS in general follows the lines of Middle Indic as a whole, exemplified in both Pali and Prakrit; we shall return to this subject later. Among special forms in which it agrees with Prakrit dialects, but not with Pali, may be mentioned the past participles *bhāṣṭa* (Skt. *bhāṣita*; *cf.* AMg. *ābhaṭṭha*), *yaṣṭa* (Skt. *iṣṭa*; *cf.* AMg. *jaṭṭha*), and *palāna* (to *palāyati*; JM. *palāṇa*). The BHS gerund suffix *-i* (also *-ī*) is recorded elsewhere only in Apabhraṃśa.

As forms in which by exception BHS agrees with Pali alone, or not with most other Middle Indic dialects, we may perhaps count the following. We noted above *sthahati* = Pali *ṭhahati,* as present to root *sthā.* The dative of almost any noun of action may be used as an infinitive (my Grammar § 36.15). Especially common are such forms in *-anāya,* as in Pali; BHS also has the variant *-anāye,* which is not recorded for Pali. Prakrit seems to lack such forms; but cf. Apabhraṃśa infinitives in *-aṇa* (Pischel §579). Again, the regular passive in BHS is formed in either *-iyati* or *-īyati,* agreeing with Pali; according to Pischel §535 Prakrit has only forms that presuppose *-īyati,* not *-iyati.* As a negative agreement of this sort we may perhaps add the lack of regular change of intervocalic *p* to *v.* This change occurs, but only rarely and sporadically, in BHS, and it cannot be called dialectically regular in Pali. Thus Middle Indic causatives in general Prakrit have *-āve(-t)i,* which is sporadic and quite rare in BHS as in Pali. The regular and very common BHS ending is *-āpayati* or *-āpeti* (with Pali), which is not, I think, likely to be due to late Sanskritization.

Some scholars have tried to identify BHS with Ardhamāgadhī, the canonical language of the Jains. I myself, in an article published many years ago (BSOS 8.501 ff.), was inclined to see specially close relations between these two languages. I think now that I was wrong. The resemblances which I thought I found are not sufficiently specific; they are found in other Middle Indic dialects too. Still less compelling are later arguments tending in the same direction (see my grammar §1.23-29). This attempt at identification has clearly failed, it seems to me. I find positive proof of my present view in the fact that a considerable number of BHS grammatical features are completely lacking in AMg. These include all the features listed at the beginning of this lecture as BHS peculiarities. If BHS were the same as AMg., it is inconceivable that so much of its grammar should be foreign to that dialect.

LECTURE 8

BHS METRICS, PHONOLOGY, AND SAṂDHI

In the last three lectures of this course, I shall attempt a bird's eye view of the normal grammar of BHS. When I say 'normal grammar' I mean that I shall in general present forms which I believe were regular, at least in the underlying Prakrit, and usually in our texts as represented in the manuscripts. Very rare and sporadic forms, tho recorded in my Grammar, will ordinarily be ignored here, except some which seem to have special linguistic interest.

First, however, it seems necessary to say something about BHS metrics, because that subject has important bearings on the phonology and even the morphology. Several times in earlier lectures I have referred to a monograph of mine called 'Meter, Phonology, and Orthography in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit' (JAOS 66.197 ff.) In this I showed that BHS meters adhere very rigidly to required successions of long and short syllables, just as much as Sanskrit meters do. But unlike Sanskrit, syllables in BHS may be arbitrarily (as it seems to us) lengthened or shortened to fit a metrical scheme. Such quantitative changes are commonest at the end of words, but also occur medially. The change is most commonly effected by lengthening or shortening a vowel, but also by nasalizing or denasalizing a vowel, and by doubling a consonant or simplifying a consonant cluster (that is, reducing it to a single consonant).

Such lengthenings and shortenings are not limited to historical variations in quantity. Some of them are that; they may occur in prose, and in that case may have existed in free variation in the underlying dialect. But, for instance, the vowel *i* in verb-endings (*-mi, -si, -ti, -hi*) is often lengthened and the *ā* of the gerund ending *-(i)tvā* often shortened, purely for metrical reasons; these changes never occur in prose and certainly had no existence in the language, except as metrical alterations. Internally, also, the *ū* of the participle *bhūta* may be shortened to *u,* but only to satisfy the meter; otherwise there never was a form *bhuta*; and short vowels may be similarly lengthened.

Now we find that in verses, when a word begins in a consonant cluster, say e.g., *sth-* in a word like *sthita*, lengthening or shortening of a final vowel of the preceding word takes place exactly as if *sthita* began in a single consonant. That is, if the preceding word is, say, a verb form in *-ti* and meter requires a long syllable, *-tī* is written, tho the syllable containing *-ti* would already be long if *sth-* followed, as it does in the Sanskritic writing *sthita*; while if the preceding word is, say, a gerund in *-tvā*, but the meter requires a short syllable, we find *-tva* written, tho the following *sth-* would seem to make the syllable long even if the vowel is short.

The only possible explanation of this phenomenon seems to be that at the beginning of a word, what is written as a consonant cluster was pronounced as a single consonant, as it would have to be in normal Middle Indic, where as a general rule only one consonant can be pronounced at the beginning of a word. That is, e.g. *sthita* was pronounced *thita* or *ṭhita,* or at least with initial *th-* or *ṭh-*, as it is in Middle Indic. It seems, then, that the common Sanskritic writing of such words, with consonant clusters, must be orthographic convention only, and must misrepresent the actual pronunciation, which was Middle Indic.

This observation tempts us to very far-reaching inferences. The Middle Indic simplification of consonant clusters to single consonants implies a prior assimilation of the original consonants; in the middle of a word, *sth* for instance would be replaced by *tth* or *ṭṭh* in all Middle Indic (except Māgadhī Prakrit, which is peculiar); only initially this would be simplified to *th* or *ṭh*. Now, such assimilations, and initial simplifications, are actually *written* sometimes in our texts, in verses and prose alike, altho generally the spelling is Sanskritized.

In the Lalitavistara spelling lesson (above, Lecture 4) we read *ṭhakāre ṭhapanīyapraśnaśabdaḥ* (Skt. *sthapanīya*), and *thakāre thāma....śabdaḥ* (Skt. *sthāma*). Elsewhere we find *kk* written for Skt. *tk* and *ky*; *cc* for *cy*; *jj* for *jy*; *ḍḍ* for *ḍy*; *tt* for *kt*, *pt*, *tm*, and *rt*; *gg* for *dg*; *dd* for *dv*; *ddh* for *dhr* and *rdh*; *pp* for *py* and *rp*; *ṭṭ* for *rt*; *ḍḍh* for *rdh*; *cch* for *śc*, *śch*; *ṭṭh* for *ṣṭh*; *tth* for *st*, *sth*. And initially, *k* for *kr*; *c* for *cy*; *j* for *jy* and *jv*; *t* for *tr*; *th* for *st*, *sth*, and *ts*; *p* for *pr*; *kh* for *sk* and *skh*; *ṭh* for *st* and *sth*. These are only examples; many other Middle Indic spellings are found.

Since, then, these spellings exist, in prose and in verse where they make no difference in the meter, and since the meter proves Middle Indic pronunciation in initial position in verses universally, in spite of customary Sanskritized spelling: what are we to infer about the pronunciation of such forms in prose? There the spelling is sometimes Middle Indic, but usually Sanskritized, exactly as it is in verses, where in word-initial, the only position that permits an inference from meter, the meter proves universal Middle Indic pronunciation, contrary to the usual spelling. Can we suppose that this Middle Indic pronunciation was used only in the verses, not in the accompanying prose? We must either make that implausible assumption—or else assume that the prose, too, was pronounced as in Middle Indic, and that the Sanskritized writing misrepresents at least the original pronunciation. We cannot, of course, know at what point this Sanskritized spelling was introduced; whether when the texts were first written down, perhaps after a period of purely oral tradition, or at a later time. Nor can we tell how long the original Middle Indic pronunciation was preserved. Modern copyists no doubt would read even the verses as they are written, in defiance of the meter. But it is hard for me to avoid the conclusion that, when our texts (or at least the oldest of them) were first composed, they were couched in a thoroughly Middle Indic form, and that the largely Sanskritized writing in which our manuscripts present them was mere window-dressing, and does not correspond to original linguistic reality.

It may be of interest to mention one or two other peculiarities of BHS meter. As we have said above, syllables may be unhistorically lengthened or shortened to fit metrical requirements, by changing the quantity of a vowel, nasalizing or denasalizing it, or doubling a consonant or reducing a double consonant (or Sanskrit-written cluster) to a single consonant. There is a curious instance of this procedure: when a final short vowel, in a syllable required to be long, is followed by a single initial consonant, the consonant may be doubled. So, for *daśa-diśāsu,* or *daśasu diśāsu,* 'in the ten directions', we find (besides, and instead of, *daśā-*, *daśasū diśāsu*) *daśad-diśāsu* or *daśasud-diśāsu*; and many similar cases. The double consonant, of course, is most obviously unhistorical, and due solely to metrical convenience.

Again: in Middle Indic all word-final nasal consonants are replaced by nasalization of the preceding vowel, written anusvāra, except sometimes when followed in close juncture by a word beginning in a vowel. A syllable ending in a nasalized vowel (anusvāra) is always long, but if a word ends in vowel plus *m* and is followed by an initial vowel, the final syllable is short. BHS metrics take advantage of this allowable Middle Indic free variation between *m* and *ṃ* before initial vowels; either is used, according as a short or a long syllable is required. So Mahāvastu i.112.2 *saśiṣyaṃ idam uvāca* (meter requires *-aṃ* long, but *-am* short), and many other cases.

Middle Indic tolerates only short vowels in closed syllables (i.e. before nasalization or consonant cluster), and BHS frequently shortens Skt. long vowels in such positions (*khajjati* for *khādyate*; *kilanta* for *klānta*); so even when the consonant cluster was later broken by epenthesis (*ariya,* as in Pali, for *ārya*). Epenthesis is very common in verses of most texts, and in prose of the Mahāvastu (*ratana, viyūha, paduma* for *ratna, vyūha, padma*); and prothesis in *istrī* and variants, for *strī* (Middle Indic *itthī* etc.). For numerous other examples of Middle Indic phonology, affecting both vowels and consonants, I shall leave those who are interested to consult my Grammar.

A word should however be said about saṃdhi, which is thoroughly Middle Indic at bottom and quite unlike Sanskrit. Thus initial or final vowels may always be dropped after or before another vowel, with or without 'compensatory lengthening' of the remaining vowel. Hiatus is always permissible, too, and in verses is often guaranteed by the meter. It frequently occurs in what must have been close juncture.

Nevertheless, as in Middle Indic generally, hiatus between two adjoining vowels, whether in separate words or parts of a compound word, is very often avoided by insertion of an 'inorganic consonant' or 'hiatus-bridger', most commonly *m*, frequently *r*, less often *d*; there are a very few cases, perhaps, of *n*, but this is doubtful. Examples: *ihaiva-m-āgataḥ*; *iha-m-ākulam*; *yugam-antarasmi* (=*yugāntare*); *eka-m-ante* (Pali id.; =*ekānte*); *ati-r-iva* (Pali id.; =*atīva*); *yatha-r-iva* (Pali id.; very common there and in BHS) and *tatha-r-iva*, which in meaning correspond to Skt. *yathaiva, tathaiva,* with *eva,* not *iva* (no explanation of this aberration is known); *dṛṣṭo na jātu-r-asmābhir,* 'not at all seen by us'; *hrī-r-apatrāpya* = *hryapatrāpya*; *yathā-d-iva*; *khu-d-ayaṃ*.

LECTURE 9

BHS NOUN AND PRONOUN INFLECTION

We shall next present in brief outline the principal features of the declension of nouns and pronouns in BHS. As usual, we shall mention only non-Sanskrit (Middle Indic or hybrid) forms, and as a rule only those which occur rather frequently, so that there seems no doubt of their being real forms of the underlying dialect. In some cases, however, forms of infrequent occurrence will be noted when they are of special linguistic interest, particularly if supported by Middle Indic. Those which are nearly or quite limited to use in verses to satisfy metrical requirements will be distinguished, if mentioned at all, by the abbreviation m.c. (*metri causa,* used 'for the sake of meter').

The language shares certain broad general tendencies with Middle Indic as a whole. First, there is much mixture of the nominal and pronominal declensions; endings which in Sanskrit are peculiar to one of these are here often used in the other. Secondly, consonantal stems show a marked tendency to become vocalic stems, especially *a* or (feminine) *ā*-stems.

Another tendency is less clearly marked, and also less clearly paralleled in Middle Indic. Particularly in the *a*-declension, the bare stem, ending in *-a*, seems to be used, not only in the nominative and accusative (where it is very common, but chiefly m.c.), but also in all the oblique cases of the singular. Tho these oblique forms in *-a* are not very common, they occur too often, in my opinion, to make it likely that they are mere corruptions. Such forms are recognized by some Prakrit grammarians for Māhārāṣṭrī and other dialects (see my Grammar §§ 8.3-11). It is evident that this development of a sort of generalized singular form, identical with the 'stem' used in composition, resembles the conditions found in most modern Indo-Aryan vernaculars, which for many nouns have only one form in the singular, for others only two forms, one of which is used as base before all postpositions. Stems in *i* and *ī* seem occasionally to be used similarly as oblique singular case-forms (my Grammar §§ 10.65-69).

There is a good deal of confusion between forms which in Sanskrit are characteristic of different genders, suggesting that the formal category of gender was breaking down. I shall not list examples here; see my Grammar, Chapter 6.

Masculine and neuter *a*-stems show the following forms: Stem in composition, *ā* (generally m.c.), and nom. sg. endings like *o*, *aḥ*, for *a*. Sg. Nom. *loko* (generalized), *lokā*; m.c. *loka, loku, phala, phalu.* Voc. *lokā* (common, and not m.c.) Acc. m.c. *loka, loku, phala, phalu.* Instr. (rarely *padasā, balasā,* as in Middle Indic;) m.c. *lokenā.* Dat. *lokāye.* Abl. *lokā, lokāto* (and variants m.c.). Gen. m.c. *lokasyā.* Loc. *lokasmiṃ, lokesmiṃ* (also written *°smin*; m.c. *°smi*); m.c. *loki.* Pl. Nom. *lokā,* m.c. *loka.* Voc. *lokā* (m.c. *loka*); *lokāho.* Acc. *lokā* (and written *lokās, lokāḥ*), *loke,* m.c. *loka, loki.* Nom.-acc. nt. *phalā* (m.c. *phala*); *hṛdayāṃsi* (rare). Instr. *lokebhiḥ* and m.c. *°bhi,* both quite common; *lokehi* (regular and very common; prevails even in prose of Mahāvastu, elsewhere only in verses.) Gen. *nayanāṃ, gatāṃ* (by analogy with consonantal stems, Grammar § 8.124); m.c. *lokāna, lokānam, lokānu, lokān’*.

Feminine *ā*-stems (besides historically masculine endings, which are fairly common) often shorten *-ā* to *-a*, but hardly except m.c., in the stem in composition and the Sg. Nom. *sena.* Acc. *sena* m.c.; also *senaṃ,* with Middle Indic shortening in closed syllable, in Mv prose but in most texts only in verses; *senam* before vowel, m.c.; *senā* (the nom. form), often; *bhāryāram* or (m.c.) *°aram,* by analogy of *bhartāram, svasāram.* Oblique cases of sg. very commonly *senāye* (chiefly in Mv), *senāya,* with variants m.c. Also Abl. *senāto* (and variants); Loc. *senāyaṃ* with Middle Indic shortening.

Pl. Nom. and Acc. *senā*, m.c. *sena*; *senāyo*, in Mv *senāvo*. Instr. *senāhi*.

Stems in *-i*, *-ī*, of all Sanskrit types, and *-in* show in general identical endings throughout in each of the three genders; and the genders may have identical endings in most of the cases. Extensions in *-a* of *in*-stems, as *hastina-*, are quite common; the Mañjusrīmūlakalpa has *a*-extensions of monosyllabic *ī*-stems, *śriyā-*, *striyā-*,which may even have masculine endings in the proper name *Mañjuśrī* (Nom. *Mañjuśriyo*, gen. *°śriyasya*, etc.)and once in the word *strī*, in the phrase *striyasya puruṣasyāpi*, in a verse and guaranteed by the meter (the following *puruṣasya* is probably responsible). Besides sporadic case-endings, which here are specially common, the following may be called standard. Sg. Nom. *ṛṣi*, *kīrti*, *devi*, *ś(ī)ri*, *yogi*; *śiriḥ*, *śreṣṭhis*; *tṛptiṃ*, *vāriṃ*; *ṛṣī*, *raśmī*, *ś(ī)rī*. Voc. *nṛpati*, *pakṣi*; *maharṣī*, *-anukampī*, *Mañjuś(ī)rī*, *devī*. Acc. *śreṣṭhiṃ*, *deviṃ*, *śiriṃ*, *vāriṃ*; *muni*, *svāmi*, *kīrti*, *medini*, *śiri*; *cakravartī*, *kṛṣī*, *medinī*; *anjalīṃ*, *Kṛkīṃ*, (stem *Kṛkin*), *dṛṣṭīṃ*. Gen. M-Nt. *ṛṣisya*, *vārisya*, *śreṣṭhisya*; *nṛpatino*. Loc. M-Nt. *agnismiṃ*, *hastismiṃ*; m.c. *Śākyamunismi*. Oblique F. *kṣāntīye*, *carīye*; *buddhiye*, *striye*, *mediniye*; *devīya*, *smṛtīya*; *prītiyā*, *subhūmiyā*; m.c. *kṣāntiya*, *buddhiya*; *nārīyo*; Abl. *bhūmīto*, *Vaiśālito*; Loc. *yonīyaṃ*; *durgatiyaṃ*. Pl. Nom.-Acc. *maharṣī*, *hastī*, *bhūmī*, *dāsī*; *ṛṣi*, *sakhi*, *vṛṣṭi*, *nāri*; *-patīyo*, *śaktīyo*, *bhikṣuṇīyo*; *rāśiyo*, *dvīpiyo*, *hastiyo*, *bhittiyo*, *nāriyo*; *dvīpayo* (*-in*-stem); *rāśayo* (acc.); *asino*, *lipino*; *vanaspatyo*; *koṭyaḥ* (acc.). Instr. *munībhi*, *śaktībhi*, *ceṭībhi*; in Mv *katibhi*, *bhūmibhi*. Gen. *gṛhīṇāṃ*, *prāṇīna* (m.c.); *ṛṣiṇāṃ*, *koṭināṃ*; *bhāryā-patiṣāṃ* 'of wife and husband' (influence of *s*-stems? cf. *padasā*, *hṛdayāṃsi* above).

Stems in *u* and *ū* are on the whole analogous to those in *i* and *ī*. Sg. Nom. *camu*, *śiśu*; *camū*, *gurū*; Nt. m.c. *bahū*. Voc. *bhikṣu*; *-bandhū*. Acc. *camu*, *bhikṣu*; *vadhū*, *-karṣū*; *camuṃ*, *bahuṃ* (nt.);--*abhibhūṃ* (masc.); *-ketunam* (masc.), *bhikṣuṇa* (m.c.); *prabhaviṣṇuvam*. Abl.-Gen. masc. *hetuno*, *bhikṣuṇo*. Gen. masc.-nt. *agarusya*, *agaruṣya*, *bhikṣusya*; *sarvābhibhūsya* (also Instr. *°bhūnā*); Loc. masc.-nt. *bhikṣusmiṃ*;

Mahāvastune. Oblique fem. *lokadhātūye*; *śvaśruye*; *dadrūya*; *śvaśruya*; Loc. *lokadhātūyaṃ* (and Gen. *śvaśrūyaṃ*). Pl. Nom.-Acc. *bhikṣū*, *lokadhātū*; *maru*, *dhātu*; *lokadhātūyo*, *°uyo* (fem.); *bahavo* (acc.); *madguvo*; *bhikṣuṇo*; m.c. *bhikṣūṇa*. Nom. and Voc. *bhikṣūḥ*. Instr. *bahūhi*; *gurūbhi*; *bhikṣuhi*; *marubhi* (m.c.). Gen. *maruṇāṃ* (not m.c.); *bhikṣuṇam*, *bhikṣūṇam*, before vowels (*a* m.c.).

Stems in *ṛ* (*ar*, *ār*) are very Middle Indic. They may substitute *a* or *ā*, rarely *i*, very often *u*, for *ṛ*; also *ra* (*rā*, *rī*) or *ara* (*arā*, *arī*) or *āra* may replace the stem final. Thus, *a* for *ṛ*: *napta-*, stem in composition; *Māndhātaḥ* (nom.), *Māndhātasya* (gen.); *ā* for *ṛ*, *mātā-pitaraṃ*, *śāstā-bhūtaṃ*; *-duhite*, *-dhīte* (voc.); *mātāṃ*, *duhitāṃ* (acc.); *mātāye* (oblique sg.); *mātā*, *svasā*, *anubhoktā*, *mātā-pitā* (all nom.-acc. pl.); stems *mātrā*, *dhītrā*, and *duhitrī* are recorded; also masc. (-nt.) stems in *-ara* (*bhrātareṇa* etc.); and even *mātarair*, *dhītareṇa*, *dhītarāṃś ca* (acc. pl.), and actually nom. sg. *dhītaro*!; but, less bizarrely, stems *mātarā* and *dhītarā* (acc. sg. *°rām*, oblique sg. *°rāya*, *°rāye*, etc). Also stems in *-āra*, chiefly nouns of agent: in comp. *śāstāra-vādin*; nom. sg. *pratigrahetāro*; acc. pl. *-kartārāṃ* (for *°rān*). The stem *pranapti* (in comp.) is the only clear case of *i* for *ṛ*. But, as in Middle Indic, *u* for *ṛ* makes almost a complete inflection: stem in comp. *śāstu-*; nom. sg. *bhartu*, *pitu*, *mātu* and *mātuḥ*; acc. *śāstuṃ*; instr. *pitunā*, *duhitunā*; abl. *mātusmā* (?); gen. *śāstuno*, *pituno*; gen. pl. *śāstunām*. In my seventh lecture I have already mentioned the oblique sg. forms *mātare*, *pitare*, *dhītare*, or less commonly with *i* for *e*, which seem to me analogical to the oblique sg. fem. ending *-iye* of *i*-stems. Similarly matching that declension in the instr. pl. we find *pitṝhi* and *pitṛhi*, etc.

Nouns which in Sanskrit have stems ending in consonants are, as in Middle Indic generally, made into vocalic stems, either (1) by dropping the final consonant, leaving the preceding vowel as stem-final (with lengthening of *a* to *ā* in feminine stems), or (2) by adding *a* (in feminine stems usually *ā*) to the stem-final consonant. Thus Skt. *jagat*, 'world', becomes *jaga,* which is very common (*jaga-* in compounds; *jagam, jagasya, jage, jageṣu* etc.); or *jagata,* which is much rarer (*jagatasya,* gen. sg.). This is a neuter stem. Masculines are *vaṇija, abhiji* for *°jit, maru* and *maruta* for *marut.* Of feminine stems we find *pariṣā* and *parṣā* (for *pariṣad, parṣad*), *upaniṣā, vidyu,* and also *par(i)ṣadā, vidyutā, nirvidā* etc. Sometimes a Skt. feminine adds short *a,* apparently with change of gender; so *tvaca* (Pali also *taca*), *pratisaṃvida.*

Stems in *s,* also, most commonly lose the *s* and end in the vowel which preceded it in Skt. Thus *as*-stems of all genders appear as *a* (or fem. *ā*) stems, inflected thruout like normal BHS *a* or *ā* stems: *mana* (*manaṃ,* masc. *mūḍha-mano*; *manena* etc.); *jyoti* (gen. *jyotisya*), *arci* (n. pl. fem. *arciyo*); and *cakṣu* (pl. *cakṣūṇi,* gen. *cakṣūṇāṃ,* etc.) Less common, yet well authenticated, are forms in which a stem-final *a* (fem. *ā*) is added to the *s*: *śirasa* etc., *apsarasā*; loc. *vayase*; *jyotiṣa, cakṣuṣa.*

Sanskrit stems in *n* are made into *a*-stems in three ways, as in Middle Indic generally. (1) The pre-consonantal weak stem in *-a* is inflected like any *a*-stem. (2) To the pre-vocalic weak stem in *-n* or *-an* is added stem-final *-a,* and this stem in *-na* or *-ana* is thus inflected. (3) The same is done with the strong stem in *-ān,* producing a stem in *-āna.* In BHS the first method is much the commonest; the other two are well authenticated and about equally frequent. Examples: *mūrdho, nāmaṃ, mūrdhena, nāmena, karmasya, ātme,* etc; *mahārājñaḥ* (nom. sg.), *premnaṃ, mūrdhnena, ātmanena, rājñās* (nom. pl.), *rājñaiḥ,* etc.; *ātmāno* (nom. sg.), *rājānasya, adhvāne* (loc.), *rājānaiḥ, rājānehi* etc. Non-Sanskritic epenthesis of a vowel sometimes occurs: *mūrdhanā* (Pali *muddhanā,* Skt. *mūrdhnā*); *rājino* (gen. sg.), *rājināṃ* (gen. pl.; *i* only in this stem, as in Pali and Pkt.).

Stems in Skt. *nt* show the same three methods of transfer to the *a*-declension. But, this time, much the commonest method is addition of *a* to the strong stem, producing a stem in *-nta.* The other two however are well established, tho less common, namely addition of *a* to the weak stem in *t,* and loss of stem-final (*n*)*t*. Examples: *santo* (nom. sg.), *pibantāṃ* (acc. fem.), *mahantaṃ* (with Middle Indic shortening of medial *ā*) or *mahāntaṃ* (nom. -acc. nt.), *gaṇayantena, bharantasya,* etc.; *smarato* (nom. sg.), *tiṣṭhatāṃ* (acc. fem.); *śīlavatena, bhagavatasya,* etc.; *saṃprajāno,* °*nā* (nom. sg. m. and f.), *sthāmavaṃ* (acc. sg.), *arcimena, bandhumasya,* etc.

Among numerals, Middle Indic forms of 'two' are particularly common; *duve* and *dve* occur for all genders, with *dvi* m.c.; instr. *dvibhis, dvihi, dvīhi, duvehi, dvehi*; gen. *duvinnaṃ,* (M Indic *a*), *dvinnāṃ*. There is exceptional confusion between all three genders in the forms for 'three' and 'four'. Otherwise we may mention normal Middle Indic forms like instr. *trīhi, trihi, catuhi* (but oftener *caturhi, caturhhi*) and loc. *catuṣu*; instr. *pañcahi, saptahi* etc. There are numerous other stray Middle Indic or hybrid forms which will be found listed in my Grammar.

The personal pronouns show, as in Middle Indic, a rich variety of forms, varying greatly in both frequency and interest. For *aham,* only the phonetic variants *ham, haṃ,* (*a*)*ha,* (*a*)*hu* occur. For *tvam, tuvaṃ* is common, *tumaṃ* (regular in Pkt.; or m.c. *tuma*) rare; *tuhaṃ* (modelled on *ahaṃ,* and known in Apabhraṃśa) only once; *tvayi* and *tvaye* (Ap. *taĩ, paĩ*, acc.) rare. For the acc. sg., original gens. and dats. are used (*mama, mahyam, me, tava, tubhyam, te*), also the nom. forms *t*(*u*)*vam*. Instr. *maye, tvaye* (Pkt. *mae, tae*), *mayi, tvayi* (similarly Ap.) and *me, te* (as in Middle Indic, Vedic, and Epic Skt.) The gen. uses old dative forms, with Middle Indic *tuhya*(*ṃ*), cf. Pali *tuyhaṃ*; once probably *tuma* (analogical to *mama*; AMg. *tumaṃ*), and apparently *tvaṃ,* which is also instrumental. The loc. (*a*)*haṃmi* seems to occur once; Pkt. grammarians authorize *ahammi*. For *vayam* I have found *asme* (Pkt. *amhe*) only once, and once *asmo* by emendation; also, rarely, *no, mo,* and *me,* not always certain. For *yūyam* occurs *yuṣme,* which is Vedic, and presupposed by Pali-Pkt. *tumhe*; the latter occurs rarely with v.l. *tuṣphe,* see instr. below; rarely also *vo,* once *yuṣmākaṃ*. In the acc. pl. occurs *mo* (also as nom. and gen.; modification of *no*), *asmākaṃ* and *yuṣmākaṃ*; *yuṣme* and *yuṣmi* are rare; the Skt. nom. forms are also used. Instr. *asmehi* (Pali-Pkt. *amhehi*), and once each *yuṣmehi*, *tumhehi*; once each *asmair* (Sanskritized) and *yuṣme*, cf. Pkt. *amhe*; *tusphehi* or *tuspehi*, mss. once, cf. AMg. *tubbhe*, Aśokan *tuphehi* and nom.-acc. *tuphe*, cf. under the nom. pl. above. Gen. once *asma* (Pkt. *amha*) and repeatedly *mo* in Mv (also nom. and acc.) and *maṃ*, which occurs also once as acc.; once apparently *nu* for *no* = *nas*; and once *tus* for *vas*.

In the generic pronouns, we often find nominal for pronominal endings, as well as the reverse in nouns. So *taṃ* etc. for *tad* etc. (also as grammatical 'stem' in compounds!); loc. sg. *sarve*, *anye*, and fem. *tāyāṃ*; gen. pl. *tānaṃ*, m.c. *tāna*, and the curious double-ending *eteṣāṇāṃ* (as in Pali *-esānaṃ*). Other non-Skt. forms, not always paralleled in Middle Indic, are instr. sg. *etinā*, *ekinā*, *iminā* (Pkt. *eiṇā*, *imiṇā*, Pali *iminā*); gen. sg. *kisya* (Pali *kissa*, Pkt. *kīsa*), most commonly as adv., 'why'?; gen. sg. *se*, *si* for *tasya* (*tasyās*), as in Pkt., and *sānaṃ*, gen. pl., unknown elsewhere; loc. sg. *tahiṃ*, *yahiṃ*, *kahiṃ*, *imahiṃ*, as in Pali-Pkt., commonly as adverbs (= *tatra*), also *tahi* etc., once *ekahi*; rarely *taṃhi*, *imaṃhi*, cf. Pali *tamhi*; acc. pl. *te* etc., as in Middle Indic.

Like Pali and Pkt., BHS has a pronominal stem *na*, usually regarded as a reduced form of Skt. *ena*. It shows only acc. sg. *naṃ*, fem. *nāṃ*, and once gen. pl. *neṣāṃ*, (Pali *nesaṃ*).

In the inflection of *ayam*, we find (as in Pkt., not Pali) nom. sg. m. and f. *imo*, *imā*, as well as all other cases formed from the stem *ima-* (as in Pali also); *ima-* is even used as stem in composition. Further, *ayaṃ* may be used as feminine, as in Pali and Pkt.; and both *ayaṃ* and *iyaṃ* may replace *idaṃ* as neuter, as in Aśokan. In the instrumental sg. there are a few cases of *ena* (as in Māhārāṣṭrī and Ap. *eṇa*).

Noun suffixes, both primary and secondary, show many divergences from standard Sanskrit. These often parallel Middle Indic, as in the spread of the suffix *ima*, chiefly contrastive in force, replacing Skt. (*a*)*ma* in such stems as *purima, uttima, carima, madhyima,* etc. A Middle Indic use of the suffix *ka* is what I have called the 'specifying *ka*', used in supplementary reference to a condition previously mentioned, 'the one who was....' Thus, *sarvāmānuṣaduṣṭadāruṇa-gṛhīteṣu....gṛhītakaṃ mastake spṛśet, svastho bhavati,* 'in the case of people seized (possessed, by demons, *gṛhīteṣu*).... one should touch the possessed person (*gṛhītakaṃ*)....on the head, and he will get well.' For other new uses of suffixes see Chapter 22 of my Grammar.

LECTURE 10

THE BHS VERB

The most far-reaching and striking grammatical difference between Sanskrit and BHS concerns the regular verb system. In Skt. the present system is regularly formed in ways which show no correlation with other parts of the verb inflection. In BHS, and in Middle Indic generally, all *regular* verb forms, including verbal nouns and adjectives (and even many primary noun derivatives not commonly associated with the verb inflection), are based on the present stem, which functions as 'root'. Exceptions are relatively infrequent, and must be classified as irregular; most of them are relic-forms inherited from Sanskrit; they do not fit into the regular BHS system. All this is equally true of Middle Indic as a whole, tho it has not been recognized with sufficient clarity by most writers on Middle Indic grammar. An honorable exception was Hermann Jacobi, who in his Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī (especially §52) recognized it very clearly for that dialect.

It is true that, historically speaking, some other verb forms (notably futures, and past participles in *ta*) seem to have helped to give rise to some new verb formations in Middle Indic and BHS. But there is reason to believe that they did so, as a rule, by first creating new presents, which then served as bases for creation of other new verb forms.

That it is, normally, precisely the present stem, rather than any other form of the verb, which serves as base for other forms, seems to me proved by the constant use in this way of unmistakable present bases, which cannot be confused with Sanskrit 'roots'. All sorts of verb forms, and even noun derivatives, are regularly made from stems like *paśya-*, *manya-*, *iccha-*, *sīda-*, *tiṣṭha-*, *jaha-*, *piba-*, and Sanskrit passives in *-ya-*, which orginally existed only in the present system.

New formations are not made thus freely from Sanskrit verbal 'roots' nor from any other inflectional forms. It seems worth while to quote some examples.

To *paśya*(*ti*) : fut. *paśyiṣyāmi*; aor. *paśyi*; ger. *paśyitvā*, *paśyiya*; inf. *paśyitum*; caus. *paśyayanti*.

To *manya*(*ti*, *-te*) : fut. *-manyiṣyati*; aor. *manyetsu*; ppp. *manyita-*; ger. *avamanyitvā*; gdve. *avamanyitavya-*.

To *iccha*(*ti*) : fut. *-icchiṣyati*; ppp. *icchita-*; inf. *-icchitum*; gdve. *icchitavya-*; caus. *-icchāpaya* (impv.)

To *sīda*(*ti*) : fut. *niṣīdiṣyāmo*; aor. *niṣīdi*; ger. *niṣīditvā*, *niṣīdiyāna*; gdve. *niṣīditavya-*; caus. ger. *niṣīdāpayitvā*.

To *tiṣṭha*(*ti*) : aor. *tiṣṭhetsuḥ*; ger. *tiṣṭhitvā*.

To *jaha*(*ti*) : fut. *jahiṣyāmi* (also Epic Skt.); aor. *jahi*; ppp. *jahita-*; ger. *jahitvā*, *vijahiyāna*, *vijahiya*.

To *piba*(*ti*) : fut. *pibiṣyati*; aor. *pibe*; ger. *pibitvā*; inf. *pivitum*; caus. (opt.) *pivāpayet*.

Passive stems : *khajjati*, Middle Indic for *khādyate*, 'is eaten'; fut. *khajjiṣyasi*.—*dīyate*, 'is given'; fut. *dīyiṣyati*.—*dṛśyate*, 'is seen'; aor. *dṛśyiṣu*, 'they were seen'.—*dhūyate*, 'is shaken'; aor. *saṃdhūyetsuḥ*.—*paccati*, Middle Indic for *pacyate*, 'is cooked'; fut. *paripacciṣyati*.—*bādhyate*, 'is oppressed'; fut. *bādhyiṣyate*; aor. *vādhyi*.—*bhajjati*, Middle Indic for *bhajyate*, 'is broken'; fut. *bhajjiṣyati*.—*bhijjati*, Middle Indic for *bhidyate*, 'is split'; aor. *bhijje*. —*mucyate*, 'is released'; aor. *mucyiṣu*; inf. *mucyituṃ*.—*yujyate*, 'is joined'; aor. *saṃyujyiṣu*.—*hanyate*, 'is smitten, slain'; ppp. *vihanyita-*.

It will be noted that all the presents in the above list are 'thematic' stems, ending in *a*. The majority of regular presents in BHS are of this type. The stem-final *a* is always lost before endings beginning with a vowel (commonly *i*). This, Jacobi's 'first conjugation,' is the commonest in Middle Indic generally. Many such presents are inherited from Sanskrit, but many others are substituted for athematic presents of Sanskrit. Athematic presents, in fact, no longer exist as a regular type in BHS or Middle Indic. Most of them are drawn into the thematic conjugation in one way or another; so for instance to Skt. 3 pl. *kurvanti* 'they make' is formed a new, analogical 3 sg. *kurvati* (Pali *kubbati*, Pkt. *kuvvai*) and a complete thematic conjugation. To be sure, some athematic forms were common enough to persist, as relic forms, and even sometimes generate new, analogical creations, especially if the stem ends in a long vowel, so that it fits descriptively into our second conjugation, stems in long vowels. Thus 3 sg. *karoti* not only is preserved (beside the new *kurvati*), but forms analogically a pl. *karoma, karotha, karonti*; and to 3 sg. *eti* 'goes' is formed 3 pl. *enti*, forming a 'regular' inflection which descriptively fits into our 'second-conjugation' present stems in *e*. We shall describe later the most important ways in which thematic presents replace athematic ones of Sanskrit.

The regular paradigm of this 'first conjugation', founded on thematic present stems, the commonest category of regular BHS verbs, may be set up as follows. The verb chosen is the stem *śruṇa-* 'hear'; most, tho not quite all, of the forms listed occur from this verb. We ignore rare and sporadic forms.

Present indicative : sg. *śruṇāmi, śruṇasi, śruṇati*; pl. *śruṇāma(s), śruṇatha, śruṇanti.*

Optative : *śruṇe(t), śruṇi, śruṇeyā, °ya* (all used for all persons and both numbers).

Imperative : 2 sg. *śruṇa, śruṇāhi*; 3 sg. *śruṇatu*; 2 pl. *śruṇatha* (with ending of indic.); 3 pl. *śruṇantu.*

Present participle: *śruṇanta-, śruṇata-* (rarer *śruṇa-*); *śruṇa-māna-.*

Future : *śruṇiṣyati* etc. (like present).

Aorist : *śruṇi, śrunī, śruṇe(t)* (all used for all persons and both numbers); also 3 pl. *śruṇiṣu, śruṇiṃsu, śruṇetsu(ḥ).*

Past passive participle : *śruṇita-.*

Gerund : *śruṇitvā, śruṇitvāna, śruṇiya, śruṇiyāna, śruṇi.*

Infinitive : *śruṇitum.*

Gerundive : *śruṇitavya-.*

Passive : *śruṇīyati, śruṇiyati* etc. (inflected even outside the present system).

Causative : *śruṇāpayati*, *°peti* etc. (inflected thruout).

There is however one other regular and productive type of verb inflection, which may be called the 'second conjugation'. Just as in the first, it is normally based thruout on the stem of the present indicative. But that stem ends not in the thematic vowel *a*, but in a long vowel; most commonly *e*, often *ā*, sporadically other long vowels. And whereas in the first conjugation the stem-final *a* is lost before any vowel of an ending, in the second the stem-final long vowel is generally retained before all endings; and if an ending begins with the vowel *i*, which would replace the *a* of a thematic stem, this *i* is in general lost after the long stem-final vowel. (However, the optative, past passive participle [except from *ā*-stems], passive, and causative have as a rule no distinctive forms in the two conjugations.) In the aorist there is a further important difference, perhaps the most striking of all, between the two conjugations. After a stem in long vowel we regularly find a sibilant inserted, which is lacking in the thematic conjugation : *thapesī*, *adāsi*, contrasting with *śruṇi*, *cari*. This is also characteristic of all Middle Indic dialects which preserve the aorist, such as Aśokan, Pali and Ardhamāgadhī.

The second conjugation is more fragmentary than the first. The long stem-vowel is most commonly *e*, usually from Skt. *aya*; the majority of such verbs stem historically from original causatives and denominatives. The following sketch indicates the regular pattern; no full set of forms is quotable from any verb.

Present indicative : *demi, desi, deti, dema,* (*detha,*) *denti.*

(Optative, like the 1st conjugation : *krameyā* etc.).

Impv. 2 sg. *-nehi* (cf. Skt. *dehi*); 3 sg. *detu*; pl. *detha, dentu.*

Future : *-dheṣyati* etc.; a special case is *bheṣyati,* isolated, from Skt. *bhaviṣyati.*

Aorist : *-dhesi,*

(Past passive participle, like the 1st conjugation, and often from corresponding Skt. forms, as *-dhita-*, *kārita-*.).
Gerund : *sthapetvā, -lobhetvāna.*
Infinitive : *krametuṃ, -metuṃ.*
Gerundive : *grahetavya-*.
(Passive and causative, like the 1st conjugation.)

Stems in *ā*, of miscellaneous origins, show such forms as these :
Present indicative : *dāmi, dāsi, pradanti* (Middle Indic short *a*); *-dhāmi, -dhāti*; *-sthāmi, sthāti*; *prādurbhāmi* (isolated, root *bhū*).
Imperative : *-sthāhi*; *-sthātu*; *śraddadhādhvam*; isolated are *bhāhi* (to root *bhī*), *apacāhi*.
Present participle : weak stem *sthāt-*.
Future : *adattādāsyatha, jāsyate* (passive; Epic Skt. *jāsyati*), *-dadhāsyasi, -dadhāsye, svādhyāsyati*; *kāhiti* etc. (root *kṛ*, cf. aorist).
Aorist : *agāsi, adāsi* and *°sīt, -bhāsi* (to *bhā*, or to *bhās*, 1st conjugation), *asthāsi* and *°sīt, nirvāsu, -vāṃsu, (a)kāsi* (to *kṛ*, cf. future), *udapāsi* (adaptation of *udapādi*).
Past passive participle : *-dadhāta-*, *śraddhāta-*, *palāta-* and *palāna-*.
Infinitive : *-dadhātum.*
Gerundive : *svādhyātavya-*, *-dadhāṇīya-*.

Stems in *ī* : Only sporadic forms. Skt. *abravīt* is modified to *abravīṣi*, matching this type. Skt. future *gṛahīṣyati* seems responsible for the aorist *-grahīṣī(d)*; future *-grhīṣyāmi* is also written, as in Epic Skt., and like it (cf. Skt. ppp. *gṛhīta-* ?) inf. *-gṛhītuṃ* and gdve. *-gṛhītavya-*. Such 3 pl. aorists as *āsīsu* (v. l. *āsītsu*) and *abravītsu* are based on Skt. *āsīt, abravīt*, the two last with ending matching BHS *-etsu*, which is however found in the 1st as well as the 2d conjugation. To root *nī* are formed *samudā-nīmahe* and gdve. *a-vinīya-*, modelled perhaps on ppp. *nīta-*, cf. Skt. *adhīte* : *adhīta-*; cf. also future, with passive meaning, *nīṣyati*. Skt. has, beside *adhīte*, a rarer *adhīyati*; by analogy with this pair is formed a future *adhīṣyati*, matching 'regular' *adhīyiṣyati*; also *patīṣyati*, to BHS *pa*(*t*)*tīyati*, for more usual *pattīyiṣyati*. Similar are BHS *allīṣyati*, fut., and *allīpayati*, caus., to *allīyati* (a more 'regular' fut. *allīyiṣyati* occurs once as a v. l.), related to Skt. root *lī* (note BHS ppp. *allīna*-). Gerunds which are pertinent in this place are, from weak 9th class presents, *abhinirmiṇīya*, *gṛhṇīya*, *gṛhṇītvā*, *gṛhṇīyāna*; from weak 3d class presents, *abhinirmimīya*, *jihrīya*. From such stems a few other forms, more or less dubious, seem perhaps to be made : fut. *krīṇīṣyati*; aor. *udgṛhṇīṣu*; passive pres. pple. *abhinirmimīyantam*.

Stem in *ū*; only root *bhū*, which has no present stem in *ū*; but the preterite *abhū* (Skt. root aorist *abhūt*) yielded, on such a model as *adā*(*t*) : *adāsi*, the regular aorist of this root in BHS, *abhūṣi*, which is not clearly paralleled anywhere else (Aśokan 1 sg. *husaṃ*, 3 pl. *husu* could be connected). The isolated 1 sg. future *pratibhūṣyaṃ* may perhaps be called a denominative.

As for stems in *o*, the aorist *aśroṣi* is a direct inheritance from Skt. *aśrauṣīt* and in BHS is an isolated relic form. A doubtful -*haroti* may be analogical to *harati*, on the model of *karoti* to BHS and Middle Indic *karati*. Rather doubtful also is the aorist -*karosi*, which if textually sound would be a genuine and normal 2d conjugation aorist to the present stem *karo*-. Otherwise only forms of the root *bhū* are found. This root has a normal and very common present (historically Skt. *bhavati*) *bhomi*, *bhoti*, 3 pl. *bhonti*, impv. *bhohi*; much more rarely *hoti*, which is regular in Pali. Outside of the present, the only certain forms are futures, with *h* for the future sign: 2 sg. *bhohī*, *hohī*, 3 sg. *hohiti*, *hohati*, 3 pl. *hohanti*. A future *bhoṣyati* is noted only twice in SP according to the printed text, but it seems to be a misreading; the normal future of the root is *bheṣyati* (Pali *hessati*, regular; -*bhossati* and -*hossati*, rare). There is also a rare and uncertain 3 pl. aorist *bhosiṣu*.

There is some confusion between the first conjugation and the second, especially as regards verbs in *-eti*. We saw above that they are indistinguishable from verbs in *-ati* in some inflectional categories. Further, not a few verbs are rather often inflected according to both types (e.g. *-kirati* and *-kireti*), which is true in Middle Indic generally; and in certain inflectional categories, verbs of one class rather frequently present forms proper to the other. So verbs which otherwise belong to the first conjugation are found fairly often to show 2 sg. imperatives in *-ehi* or aorists in *-esi*; and in them *-āhi* is common enough to be called regular in the 2 sg. impv. (cf. Jacobi, op. cit., § 57, end).

There are slight variations within the 2d conjugation; e.g., as we saw above, *ā*-stem verbs show past passive participles in *-ā-ta*, but no other long stem vowels are preserved before *-ta* unless in Skt. relic forms. Such matters seem to me hardly to justify dividing the group into separately numbered conjugations. But Jacobi (see above) does just this for Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī, separating verbs in *e* from those in *ā* and *o* (he says nothing of other long vowels). JM lacks the aorist, where the unity of long-vowel stems seems most clearly shown.

As in Middle Indic generally, the dual number was dead in the underlying Prakrit. Our texts have many dual forms, but oftener in nouns than in verbs; both are shown to be artificial by frequent association of plural or singular verb forms with dual noun subjects, which may also have plural pronominal or adjectival attributes.

There is great confusion in verbal person and number. Third singular forms are very commonly used with subjects of first or second person, or plural number. Third plural forms are also used thus indiscriminately, but less often. No other recorded Middle Indic seems to carry this confusion so far.

Of personal endings, 1 pl. *mas* (*mo*) and *ma* are no longer distinguished as in Skt.; meter often determines the choice.

In the 2 pl. *tha* is extremely common where Skt. would use *ta* (once, at least, the reverse is recorded). Other variations of endings are either sporadic, or questionable, or purely matters of metrical convenience (e.g. final *i*, in *-mi*, *-si*, etc., is often lengthened m.c.).

So also the thematic vowel *a* is often lengthened, and *ā* in 1st person forms shortened, m.c. As in some Prakrit dialects, *i* is sometimes substituted for thematic *a* or *ā* : *vandima* (AMg. M. *vandimo*).

Non-Sanskritic present formations commonly involve adaptations to the prevalent thematic first conjugation; these are generally paralleled in Middle Indic. To many Skt. athematic 3 pl. forms in *-anti*, such as *chindanti, kurvanti, vidanti,* and *gṛhṇanti* (where 1 sg. *gṛhṇāmi* also helped), are formed 3 sg. *chindati* etc. To 1 sg. *-āmi* (*dadāmi* etc.) likewise 3 sg. *-ati* (*dadati*, also sporadically in Vedic and Epic; since this is identical with the old 3 pl. of the reduplicating verbs, e.g. Skt. *dadati*, we also find *jāgrati* and *juhvati* used as 3 sg.). Old Skt. thematic aorists like *alipat, asicat* produce presents *lipati* etc. Presents like *karati*, *jāgarati* (once in Mbh.), *dharati*, *marati, starati* (sporadic in Skt.), *hanati* (Epic and late Skt.), *bandhati*, and *vadhati* seem to me based on futures, *kariṣyati* etc.; the future is an extremely common form in Middle Indic, and there are many Skt. pairs like *harati*, pres., *hariṣyati*, fut.

Verbs of the Skt. 5th class often in Pali, and regularly in Prakrit, are transferred to the 9th class, and still more often then (like original 9th class verbs) to the thematic conjugation. In BHS 5th class verbs also appear regularly as thematic, e.g. *śruṇati* from *śṛṇoti*, perhaps thru the intermediate stage of the 9th class (*śruṇāti*), tho distinctively 9th class forms hardly occur from them here.

New thematic presents are also made in other ways in BHS, for instance as denominatives from past participles: *buddhati*, *ṛddhati*, *baddhati*, *-ruddhati*, *lagnati* (Pali and Pkt. *laggati*, wrongly interpreted as for **lagyati* by Geiger and

Pischel). There are numerous new stems in *-ya*, after consonants and (by complicated and interesting analogical processes, see my Grammar §28.20-25) after long vowels, especially *ā*. Other new presents of both the first and the second conjugations are sporadic, tho often interesting; they are treated in my Grammar, Chapter 28, but space forbids dealing with them here.

The rest of the verbal inflection can be treated here only with the utmost brevity. In the future, note forms with medial *h* for *s*(*y*) : *kāhiti* (to *kṛ*), *hohati* (to *bhū*); common is the 1 sg. ending *-aṃ* (*jīviṣyaṃ* etc.) or (mostly m.c.) *-a*. The aorist merits, and has received in my Grammar Chap. 32, very detailed treatment, but many of its most salient features have been mentioned above. The perfect is virtually dead; but note the 3 pl. *āhaṃsu*, *ah°*, to *āha*, as in Middle Indic. The regular past participle, in all thematic and *eti* verbs, adds *ita-* to the present stem minus final vowel; yet there are a few cases of new (Middle Indic) forms in *ta-*, lacking the *i* (*bhāṣṭa*, *yaṣṭa*, etc.) The gerundive suffix *itavya-* is very freely, *anīya-* rarely, added to present stems.

The regular and indefinitely productive gerund suffixes are *itvā*, *itvāna*, *iya*, *iyāna*, and *i* (the last as in Apabhraṃśa), all added to thematic and *e*-stems (also *tvā* and *tvāna* to the latter). The infinitive regularly shows *itum* added to thematic stems; also, but infrequently, *tum* after stems in *e* and *ā*. The Vedic ending *tave* occurs, as in Pali and Aśokan, in the isolated *attave* 'to eat' (twice). Commoner is the ending *anāya*, as in Pali; also *anāye*. Datives of other noun stems are sporadically used as infinitives.

The passive voice ends in *īyati* or *iyati*, added to thematic stems or stems in *e* (*aya*), which in this case is lost before the passive sign: *kathīyati*, *darśiyati* (from *e*-stems), *karīyati*, *kariyati* (from an *a*-stem). Both (with *iyyati*=*īyati*) are found in Pali; only equivalents of *īyati* (*īa*, *ijja*, *iyya*=*īya*) in Prakrit. The endings are regularly active. Middle endings in BHS as a whole are sporadic, and apt to be indistinguishable in meaning from the active endings.

Causatives usually have the regular Middle Indic sign *-āpayati* (*-āpeti*); the Prakritic *-āveti* is quite rare, as it is in Pali. They are extremely common, and show ramifications which deserve extended discussions (see my Grammar Chap. 38).

A syntactic matter of considerable interest is the varied use of the particle *mā*, modal negative. It is used far more freely than in normal Sanskrit; with the optative and the present and future indicative, and with no finite verb at all. While still common in prohibitions and 'lest' clauses, as in Sanskrit, it is also much used in expressions of strong negative wish or hope, often translatable by expressions of fear. These most commonly refer to future events, but may also relate to the present or past. This use shades over into expressions of dubiety, uncertainty, or worry (almost invariably about something deprecated or regarded as undesirable; rarely only about something the speaker regards as improbable). Such expressions are sometimes clearly interrogative in tone: 'I hope......not?' 'It isn't so, is it?', 'isn't there reason to fear that......?' 'isn't (regrettably)....?' Presumably in actual speech these were distinguished by interrogative intonation. In default of any way of indicating this in the text, it is often difficult or impossible to be sure whether it was present or not. In any event, the *mā*-clause becomes a precise negative to a clause with *kaccit,* which, as in Sanskrit, introduces a question which implies hope on the speaker's part. A *kaccit* clause implies hope of a positive answer, unless it contains *na*, when the hope is for a negative answer; and *mā* in BHS may be used as a precise equivalent of *kaccin na*: *māsi dāsī*? 'You aren't a slave-woman, are you ?'